

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, April 25, 1984

The House met, at 3 p.m., and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY) laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WRIGHT):

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 24, 1984.

I hereby designate the Honorable THOMAS S. FOLEY to act as Speaker pro tempore on Wednesday, April 25, 1984.

JIM WRIGHT,
Speaker pro tempore,
House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Richard E. Downing, St. James Episcopal Church, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everlasting God, we praise Thee for all that Thou hast done for the United States of America. Give us Thy grace to deepen the root of our life as a nation in Thy everlasting righteousness, lest Thy blessings be withdrawn. Make us equal to the trust Thou hast placed upon us, reverent in the use of freedom, just in the exercise of power, and generous in the protection of weakness. Inspire the men and women who direct this Nation that they may guide it wisely; give insight, faithfulness, and strength to our legislators; and may our deepest trust always be in Thee, the Lord of Nations and the King of Kings; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

ANSEL ADAMS—THE EARTH HAS LOST A GREAT FRIEND

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, as news reports have confirmed over the last 2 days, this Nation, and my district in particular, have lost one of the world's truly great giants in nature photography by the passing of Ansel Adams.

He died late Sunday at age 82 in the Community Hospital of the Monterey Peninsula, near the Point Lobos and Big Sur coastlines where he lived, worked, photographed, and battled for his beloved environment.

Photography to Ansel was not a business—it was a consummate joy. He deeply cared about what he photographed because he knew that photographs alone could never fully preserve the beauty and magnificence of nature.

For him, the greatest gift God had granted him was Earth itself, and surely he was Earth's greatest friend. He once wrote of nature: "It is all very beautiful and magical here . . . a quality which cannot be described."

His photographs, more than any words, came the closest to capturing that beauty and magic.

While we will miss his personal friendship and vitality, there is great comfort in knowing that his work will go on to inspire future generations with his love of nature and his great dedication to its preservation.

For those interested in commenting on his contributions, I will have a special order on this coming Tuesday.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 509 AND OF H.R. 1029

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 509 and of H.R. 1029.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TOMORROW TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 5395

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services have until midnight tomorrow, Thursday, April 26, 1984, to file a report on H.R. 5395, the Department of Energy National Security and Military Applications of Nuclear Energy Authorization Act of 1985. The minority concurs in this request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MORE THAN MEETS THE EYE

(Mr. WISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, my State of West Virginia has not fared well in various ratings over the past few years.

What West Virginians have always known has just been made public. A recent study conducted by Prof. Robert Pierce of the State University of New York, places two West Virginia cities (including my hometown of Charleston, WV) among the Nation's top 10 best cities in which to live. According to his research, Charleston ranks in the top 15 percent among the safest U.S. cities. It has one of the lowest violent crime rates. Charleston ranks in the top quarter of American cities with a comfortable climate, quality of housing at a reasonable cost and availability of public transportation. The State is also one of the country's leading energy producers.

We West Virginians have long treasured our attractive quality of life. As a matter of fact, just yesterday a Charleston newspaper stated that West Virginia has the highest percentage of homeownership in the entire country. As the newspaper pointed out, it says something about the "stability of our work force" and our "commitment to family, home, and basic American values."

Now that the secret is out, Mr. Speaker, we will roll the red carpet out. Pay us a visit in West Virginia. You will see why we are proud!

INDEFENSIBLE CUTS IN VETERANS' HEALTH CARE PROGRAMS

(Mr. BIAGGI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my opposition to a report issued by the Congressional Budget Office which proposes draconian and indefensible cuts in health care programs affecting millions of veterans in this Nation.

According to today's Jack Anderson column, the CBO will propose cuts totaling more than \$3.3 billion a year from the VA operating budget beginning in fiscal year 1985. These savage cuts would be accomplished through imposing means tests on veterans including those over 65 who seek care. It

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

would also impose a new copayment process including a \$356 deductible for any hospital stay up to 60 days in length.

As the article states:

The most severe impact of the proposed cutoffs would be on older veterans who have no service connected condition but who need long term care. A significant number of these World War I and World War II veterans would no longer be eligible for VA medical care.

Hopefully we can avert this proposal from even being introduced as legislation. It represents a mentality which has no place in our policy toward those Americans who fought to keep our Nation free in time of war. For us to turn our backs on those veterans in their hour of need would be the very height of cruelty. Veterans in this Nation deserve and have warranted our respect—and deserve to have the medical care they need. They do not need the cold back of the hand from their Government.

"WHERE'S THE BEEF"? LET'S LOOK AT THE NATIONAL DEBT

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, our national debt now stands at \$1.488 trillion. Who can comprehend that amount of money? I have done a little arithmetic to make it easier to understand:

You want to know "Where's the beef"?—The national debt would buy 4,907 Wendy's hamburgers for every American—that is over 235 million of us. You want to invite the rest of the world to lunch? How about 244 hamburgers for every person in the world.

For Americans, the per capita debt equals \$6,330.30.

If we paid \$1,000 on the debt every second, it would take 47 years to pay it off.

In \$1 bills stacked up, it would reach halfway to the Moon.

Laid end-to-end, it could go 51.3 million miles past the Sun, or circle the Earth at the Equator 5,790 times.

In \$1 bills, it weighs more than 1½ million tons—more than the total combined weight of 15 carriers, 2 battleships, 4 dock landing ships, 9 amphibious assault ships, 4 fleet oilers, 2 cruisers, and 12 destroyers.

I am introducing legislation today to help reduce the national debt. I hope my colleagues will read more about my bill in the Extensions of Remarks section of today's RECORD and join me in this effort.

WHAT GENDER GAP?

(Mr. CARNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing a lot about a gender gap lately. The media would have us believe this is a Republican problem. Why? Republicans are not responsible for the income gap between men and women. Moreover, suggestions that we want to limit opportunities for women are unfounded and unfair. It should be noted that the only woman sitting on the Supreme Court was appointed by a Republican President, the only two females in the other body are Republicans. And, as a member of the House Science and Technology Committee, I am proud to point to our professional staff as further evidence that Republicans did not create the gender gap.

Most people would agree that it is not always easy to find qualified women for science and engineering positions, simply because fewer women choose technical careers. Because of this, and especially because of the fact that the minority party has far fewer hiring opportunities than does the majority party, I believe we have done very well indeed.

Four out of the seven subcommittees ranking Republicans have selected women to be the technical consultants for their subcommittees. I might add that as members of the minority party, the Republicans do not have the luxury of having a consultant for each individual discipline; our consultants are expected to cover all issues that come before the subcommittee. This can cover a very broad range of disciplines, especially for a subcommittee such as Science, Research and Technology. The issues that come before this subcommittee can range from medicine, to geology, to patent legislation, and could easily challenge several people to provide the needed expertise. On my own subcommittee, Transportation, Aviation and Materials, we deal not only with legislation pertaining to all modes of transportation, but also materials and communications issues as well.

I am sure I speak for my colleagues on Science and Technology when I say that all four of the women that we have selected as our technical consultants are a credit to their professions and proof that qualified women scientists and engineers are out there. And, Mr. Speaker, I want the record to show that it was the Republicans who found them.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE DESERVE PROTECTION

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear that the American people believe that particularly brutal killers deserve to be punished by death. Since the Supreme Court first found capital

punishment statutes procedurally deficient, dozens of States have reconsidered and revised their laws to restore the death penalty to their arsenal of weapons for the protection of the public. The Supreme Court has made it plain that capital punishment does not violate the Constitution when there are sufficient procedural protections to guarantee a fair trial. The Court has told us what those procedures are, and they have been enacted into law in State after State.

The American people deserve the same protection from Federal criminals which they have insisted upon in their own States. President Reagan, in his comprehensive crime control proposal, has urged Congress to enact these procedural reforms so that the death penalty provisions already existing in Federal law may constitutionally be enforced.

This is a fairly simple proposition, Mr. Speaker. We know what the American people want. We know what the Constitution requires. All we have to do is to decide whether we have the will to protect the American people with capital punishment procedures consistent with the Constitution. In the past, the leadership of this House has never trusted the membership to make that decision. This year, Mr. Speaker, let the people's voice be heard. Let us vote.

HOUSE LEADERSHIP SHOULD WITHDRAW OPPOSITION TO CRIME BILL

(Mr. HANSEN of Utah asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HANSEN of Utah. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, two men entered the Hi Fi shop in Ogden, UT. They pulled a gun on the employees, took them down to the basement, and bound them. Parents of the employees became concerned when their children did not come home after closing time. They went to the Hi Fi shop where they were taken prisoners and bound in the basement.

First, the men poured Drano down the five victims' throats. Next they poked a ballpoint pen in one man's ear and kicked it into his skull. They raped a teenage girl. In execution style, they then shot each of the five victims in the head, forcing a son to see his mother killed, and forcing a father to see his son killed. Miraculously, two of the five victims lived.

Since 1974, these Hi Fi murderers have appealed their case on a number of occasions to higher courts, and all of the courts have upheld the conviction of first-degree murder. Unfortunately, they still have an avenue to delay the carrying out of justice—namely, the writ of habeas corpus at

the Federal level. They can now file an almost unlimited number of writs of habeas corpus. In fact, one convict in Missouri has filed over 100 writs to date. Each writ is reviewed first by the Federal district court, then by the Federal appeals court, and finally by the U.S. Supreme Court. These Hi Fi convicts could conceivably file for writs of habeas corpus until they die of old age.

After one writ has been denied, killers find new grounds to file another writ of habeas corpus to challenge a certain aspect of the case. A recent study of habeas corpus found that about 40 percent of habeas corpus petitions were filed more than 5 years after conviction, and nearly a third were filed more than 10 years after conviction. In some cases, writs of habeas corpus were being filed 50 years after conviction.

The abuse of habeas corpus must cease. It is an abuse of justice and a terrible burden on the judicial system. I, therefore, urge the House leadership to stop delaying and to withdraw their opposition to the crime bill, part of which would establish a 1-year limit on habeas corpus applications.

WE MUST HAVE ACTION ON THE CRIME PACKAGE

(Mr. MACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, when people think of southwest Florida, they think of beautiful beaches, a pleasant climate, a relaxed lifestyle, and quiet retirement communities.

They do not think of southwest Florida as a place where people are afraid to leave their homes at night.

It surprised and disturbed me when I learned from survey results that one out of four southwest Floridians is afraid to walk our streets at night, and last year 56 people were murdered in my district, 212 were raped, and over 1,200 were assaulted.

It is distressing then to have to tell my constituents that the leadership of this House can find no room on its agenda for action on criminal justice reform.

Our State and local officials have led the fight, but they cannot do it alone.

We must have action here in the House on the crime package that is now gathering dust in the Judiciary Committee.

The agenda of the American people calls for tougher sentencing, less lenient bail, the streamlining of the appeals process, and the closing of loopholes that allow criminals to go free.

I urge the House leadership to listen to the American people and to act responsibly and expeditiously on criminal justice reform.

CRIME LEGISLATION BEING HELD HOSTAGE BY HOUSE LEADERSHIP

(Mr. GREGG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Speaker, on April 13 the life of Christopher Wilder came to an abrupt end in Colebrook, NH. This was a man who was accused of killing a number of women across this country.

He died in a struggle with two courageous State police detectives, Wayne Fortier and Leo "Chuck" Jellison who grew curious about his activities while in Colebrook.

One of the State police officers was shot; Detective Jellison. He will recover.

Fortunately for us these State police officers were there to participate in stopping Mr. Wilder. But unfortunately for us, today we see that the House leadership is blocking a bill which would have allowed us to subject Mr. Wilder to prosecution. For had Mr. Wilder survived, he probably would have used the insanity defense used by Mr. Hinckley in order to avoid prosecution under Federal law.

I, therefore, call on the House leadership to release as its hostage the legislation involving crime reform and to allow us on the House floor to vote for this package which is so essential if we are to accomplish criminal reform at the Federal level.

COMPREHENSIVE CRIME CONTROL ACT SHOULD BE BROUGHT BEFORE THE HOUSE

(Mr. ROBERTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, each year 3 out of 10 households in this country are touched by crime. Every minute of every day, about the time it takes for a Member to give a speech in the House of Representatives, Americans are victims of a robbery and eight burglaries. A murder occurs every 23 minutes, a rape every 6 minutes. Our response to these statistics is a national tragedy. We have ignored the victims. We have allowed our courts and the entire justice system to ignore the right of society as a whole to live in security.

We have heard the horror stories repeated time and again on this House floor and we have been reminded that an answer to this growing problem now is in the hands of our House leadership. Reform is needed and it is needed now.

Our response should be bipartisan. Mr. Speaker, the other body has acted in a bipartisan manner with a vote of 91 to 1 in passing an omnibus crime reform package. That Comprehensive Crime Control Act now languishes

here in the House. I urge that this legislation be given a top priority—this session; 8 of every 10 Americans think our courts are ineffective and irresponsible. Urban and rural residents alike name crime as a top problem facing this country.

Let us be responsive—let us take action. I urge that the Comprehensive Crime Control Act be brought to the full House as quickly as possible.

LET US MOVE SWIFTLY TO ESTABLISH PROCEDURES FOR IMPOSITION OF DEATH PENALTY

(Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, various provisions of the U.S. Criminal Code now authorize the imposition of the death penalty for crimes of homicide, treason, and espionage. However, these sentences are generally unenforceable because they fail to incorporate a set of legislated guidelines. Today only the relevant provisions of the aircraft piracy law appear to comply with the death penalty decisions of the Supreme Court.

In 1981, murders were occurring every 23 minutes. According to the Department of Justice, in 1981, 25 million Americans were victims of crimes and 23,000 Americans were killed by criminals.

The stabbing deaths of two guards and an inmate at the Federal penitentiary in Marion, IL, in October 1983 is only one example of a need for capital punishment. Both guards were killed by inmates already serving multiple life sentences for murder. Prisoners serving life sentences can sit back and scoff at a criminal justice system which is powerless to deal with their actions. Prisoners serving life sentences are in effect immune.

Conservatives conclude that the safety of society and retribution for crime should be the predominant concern. The practice of leniency in our judicial system has not curtailed crime in America, but made it easier for a person to commit a crime knowing that his or her chances for just punishment are slim. Now it is time for us to act against the staggering increase of violent crimes. Let us move swiftly, in a bipartisan effort to establish procedures for the imposition of the death penalty.

CONGRESSIONAL PAY RAISE

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, we in this House have been working so hard over the last several weeks that some

of our colleagues believe we deserved a pay increase. And, in fact, voted for one just the other day.

That is right, one of the few accomplishments for this session of Congress so far is another congressional pay increase.

The reconciliation bill that we passed just the other day, before leaving on our Easter recess, included another pay raise retroactive to January 1 at that. Anyone who voted for that bill voted to raise his or her own pay.

The American people are justifiably sick and tired of a Congress that does little, period, does practically nothing to deal with the real crises of our times and yet manages to enrich itself.

I would say to the American people, check how your Representative voted on that bill. Did he or she vote for another secret pay hike? If so, is he or she trustworthy enough to continue to represent you in this Congress.

How long are we going to permit sneaky pay increases? How long are the people going to sit still for Congressmen who talk about deficits and vote to line their own pockets?

The budget process in this House has become a way to sneak through more congressional pay. It happened last year, it happened again this year, and we are on the track to have it happen again next year.

□ 1520

We may not be doing much in this House, we may not be working very hard, but some of us voted to have us paid more, nevertheless.

THE NEED FOR COMPREHENSIVE REFORM OF OUR CRIMINAL LAWS

(Mr. LOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Democratic leadership of this body to recognize that the American people depend on their elected officials for laws that will address the problem of crime. While much of the jurisdiction in criminal justice matters belongs to the States, it is a great tragedy that those who control this Chamber have declined to offer any leadership for the Nation whatsoever, on the need for comprehensive reform of our criminal laws.

While the other body has taken action to reform our bail laws, sentencing, capital punishment procedures, exclusionary rule, forfeiture rules, habeas corpus law, and many other areas, such action was greeted by the leadership of this body with such comments as "dead on arrival," and remarks that many of these changes are "too controversial."

While it may be true that omnibus reform of our criminal laws is a diffi-

cult process requiring action by a number of subcommittees as charged by some of the critics of the President's Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1983, such naysaying has a way of actualizing itself. The fact of the matter is that the only reason that we do not have a comprehensive crime reform bill on the floor of this Chamber is that those in the Democratic Party who control the committee structure of this House have consciously made the decision not to act on it. This is evidenced by the fact that the bill was not even referred to the relevant subcommittees with jurisdiction for nearly 1 year. By contrast, the fact that the other body promptly went to work on omnibus criminal justice reform and passed legislation reflects a different set of priorities.

The admonition of Scripture is appropriate in that we are told that "ye shall know them by their fruits." Needless to say, when it comes to crime legislation in the House, the "pickings have been pretty slim."

VOLUNTARY SCHOOL PRAYER, BALANCED BUDGET AND LINE-ITEM VETO CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

(Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would hope to offer a unanimous-consent request calling for the consideration of the amendments to permit voluntary school prayer, a balanced budget amendment, and the line-item veto.

The Chair has ruled that to make these requests in order I have to have the approval of both the majority and the minority leaderships. I have received that clearance from the minority leadership, and I would now yield to any spokesman representing the Democratic majority leadership for similar consent.

As Joan Rivers would say, help me, help me.

Hearing no response, Mr. Speaker, that should make it clear to the American people who stands in the way of these three important issues—the Democratic leadership of this body.

And I think they have subscribed to that immortal counsel that you can fool some of the people all of the time and all of the people some of the time, and that is enough.

COMPREHENSIVE CRIME CONTROL ACT OF 1983

(Mr. BLILEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to join with my col-

leagues to commend the Reagan administration for its efforts to address the violence that inflicts the cities, towns, and neighborhoods of America through the Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1983.

This 44-point crime package is a major step toward stemming the tide of criminal activity which currently threatens the citizens of our Nation. Some of its most important features include: A reform of our bail laws in order to make it more difficult for a defendant that is likely to be a threat to the community to be released on bail; a provision that would establish determinate sentencing without possibility of parole; the establishment of a "good faith" exception to the exclusionary rule; and a criminal forfeiture provision that would strike at the economic base of criminal enterprises and deny those engaged in racketeering and drug trafficking the fruits of their ill gotten gain.

These and other important provisions of the bill warrant the prompt action of Congress. In this regard, I am heartened by the fact that the other body has enacted legislation embodying the concepts in the President's bill. It is my feeling that it is imperative that this House should likewise not delay any further the consideration of this much needed reform of our criminal laws.

PRESIDENT VETOED BILL ON CRIME CONTROL

(Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon during these 1-minute speeches we have heard a considerable amount from the minority about the necessity of the Congress passing a Crime Control Act. Not long ago in a nationally televised press conference the President of the United States made the same plea.

I agree that Congress needs to address this issue, but both the President of the United States and our friends on the minority side have forgotten one very critical fact. Last year this Congress passed the Omnibus Crime Control Act. The President of the United States vetoed the act. He did not like it. That act had in it the very things, the very elements, that the President in his nationally televised press conference said the Congress should pass. It had in it the very elements that the minority this afternoon said the Congress should pass. The Congress did pass it. Ronald Reagan vetoed it.

VICTIMS' ASSISTANCE

(Mr. DAUB asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, last week was Victims Assistance Week. I had the privilege of having a very distinguished and dedicated Nebraskan in my office, Shirley Kuhle of the Nebraska Crime Commission. She told me of her progress in making Nebraska one of the leading States in terms of assisting battered women. Now she has focused on even more far-reaching goals which include setting up victims assistance programs that work in conjunction with local police departments.

Imagine the difficulty I had explaining to her why this body does not find these same issues to be important ones. I had to explain that the Senate passed a comprehensive crime reform package almost immediately but the House took 51 weeks to even refer the bill to the relevant subcommittees. The House leadership has taken a "we could care less" attitude toward criminal reform and its time for some of us to speak up and protest.

This is, and always has been a nation of laws. But first of all it is a nation of individuals for whom those laws were made. Seeing as this House is the people's body, some of us want to let the American people know that we are listening. We do see criminal statistics and know that crime is a real threat to each of us and that legislation can address this important matter. Let us debate and consider this legislation.

THE INSANITY DEFENSE

(Mr. GINGRICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, all Americans were startled when President Reagan's assailant was acquitted by reason of insanity. I will not try to second guess the jury in that case, but that decision caused many Americans to take a second look at the insanity defense. One of those Americans was the victim of that crime, Ronald Reagan, and he has submitted the results of his reflections to us as part of the Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1983.

Since the last century a defendant who is truly mentally ill has been able to win acquittal by demonstrating that he did not know what he was doing or that he did not know it was wrong. In recent years, however, many courts have also permitted acquittals where a defendant lacked substantial capacity to conform his conduct to the requirements of the law. Trials have become a contest of expert witnesses, with victory going to the side with the most persuasive psychiatrist. Many a defendant has gone free, even though he knew

his acts were wrong, because his doctor said, "He could not help himself." Even worse, some courts require the prosecution to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant could control his conduct.

The President's proposal simply restores the traditional rule. No longer will a defendant be able to claim that he could not keep from doing what he knew to be wrong. Moreover, the defendant will have the burden of proving his insanity by clear and convincing evidence.

Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, it makes sense to turn back the clock. The President is seeking to protect our citizens by restoring a rule that has worked well in the past. I urge the House to support him in his effort.

□ 1530

COMPREHENSIVE CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM

(Mr. RUDD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, comprehensive criminal justice reform deserves serious consideration in the House of Representatives.

Like so many other pieces of important legislation that the American people have called on us to consider, however, such as the balanced budget/tax limitation constitutional amendment, the school prayer amendment, and the line-item veto amendment, I fear that Criminal Code reform has also fallen by the wayside in this democratically controlled House.

It is an outrage that it took the leadership 51 weeks after the introduction of the comprehensive Criminal Code reform package to even refer it to the appropriate subcommittees of the Judiciary Committee.

The other body has already acted in a bipartisan manner to approve an omnibus Criminal Code reform package on a vote of 91 to 1. Since the Democrat majority controls the House schedule, it should be crystal clear to the American people who is standing in the way of restoring the balance in our criminal justice system in favor of law-abiding citizens.

THE CRIME PACKAGE SHOULD COME TO THE FLOOR

(Mr. WEBER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, some members of the majority party have criticized our position on crime by recalling the President's veto of H.R. 3963 in the last Congress. This was a crime measure which was rushed through in the closing moments of the last Congress. I would agree with them that there were several good provi-

sions on that bill. I would also argue that there were several questionable provisions in that bill which would have in fact complicated the process of fighting crime. The President concluded that the bad features outweighed the good, and while any one might have made a different judgment, I can understand how the President reached his.

Nevertheless, the half-hearted measure passed by the last Congress is no excuse to the failure of this Congress to act. The other body has passed bail reform and sentencing reform; the majority leadership in this House has not given us the chance to vote on either. The leadership has not given us a chance to vote on the reform of the insanity defense or the restoration of the death penalty. Neither have we had an opportunity to restrict the absurd practice by which important probative evidence is excluded from consideration by the jury because of technical infringements of obscure judicial rules by police.

The record of the coming months will show whether or not the 98th Congress is serious about crime control. President Reagan and his supporters in this House have put together a comprehensive and effective package to give the American people the protection they need. We call upon the leadership of this House to move that package to the floor for a vote.

WORRY, WORRY; WAIT AND WAIT

(Mr. LUNGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, one gentleman today, one gentleman yesterday and the Speaker, on March 27, tried to deflect criticism on the question of the crime control package by suggesting that the President essentially vetoed this same bill a year and a half ago. That is absolute nonsense; it is garbage; it has nothing to do with the facts. The President vetoed a 6-point package that had only four elements that even looked like elements in his 42-point package. They are not even talking about the other 38.

The bill that the President vetoed had nothing to do with sentencing reform; had nothing to do with bail reform; had nothing to do with changing the exclusionary rule; had nothing to do with the insanity defense; had nothing to do with changing habeas corpus; had nothing to do with reestablishing capital punishment, and a whole host of other things.

All right, you have criticized the President for his veto, but what is the excuse for these 2 years to sit here day-in and day-out and refuse to bring it up? The insanity defense has not

been brought up to this floor. Most Members do not know that the child pornography bill has not yet passed in final form. We passed out a version of this last year; it is my information the compromise version is sitting at the Speaker's desk where it has been sitting for 4 weeks.

If you happen to be a head of a major labor union, you can get this House to change a Supreme Court decision within 28 days; if you happen to be concerned about child pornography, you have to worry, and worry, and wait, and wait.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS SPONSOR OF H.R. 5345

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a sponsor of the bill, H.R. 5345.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 2570, TO CONTINUE TRANSITION PROVISIONS OF THE BANKRUPTCY ACT UNTIL MAY 26, 1984

Mr. WHEAT, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 98-698) on the resolution (H. Res. 490) providing for the consideration of the Senate bill (S. 2570) to continue the transition provisions of the Bankruptcy Act until May 26, 1984, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4275, RECLAMATION HYDROELECTRIC POWER-PLANTS AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1983

Mr. WHEAT, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 98-699) on the resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4275) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain hydroelectric powerplants at various existing water projects, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1985

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 480 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES 480

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4974) to authorize appropriations to the National Science Foundation for fiscal years 1985 and 1986, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science and Technology now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, and each section of said substitute shall be considered as having been read. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. WHEAT) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TAYLOR), for purposes of debate only, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 480 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 4974, the National Science Foundation Authorization Act for fiscal years 1985 and 1986. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be divided equally and controlled between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology and makes in order an amendment in the nature of a substitute which is recommended by the Committee on Science and Technology and is now printed in the bill. This amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as original text for the purposes of amendment under the 5-minute rule and each section of the substitute shall be considered as having been read.

The rule also provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4974 authorizes \$1.56 billion for the National Science Foundation for fiscal year 1985 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1986. Included in the bill is \$60 million for advanced scientific computing and \$84 million for gradu-

ate research fellowships in the fields of science and engineering.

Also included in the legislation is \$258.1 million for behavioral, social and information sciences and \$52.4 million for programs that come under Scientific, Technological, and International Affairs.

Finally, H.R. 4974 amends the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to permit the Foundation to initiate and support fundamental engineering research and engineering education programs and to provide greater flexibility in establishing special commissions by the National Science Board.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we adopt the rule so that we may proceed to consideration of this bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 480 is a 1-hour, open rule under which the House will consider legislation authorizing \$1.56 billion in appropriations for the National Science Foundation for fiscal 1985.

The rule is a straightforward open rule, allowing any germane amendments under the 5-minute rule. The rule provides that the Science and Technology Committee substitute now printed in the bill be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and each section of the substitute shall be considered as having been read.

In addition, the rule provides the usual language regarding one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the bill made in order by this rule, H.R. 4974, authorizes a total of \$1.56 billion for the National Science Foundation for fiscal 1985. This amount is a \$244 million increase over the appropriations made for fiscal 1984, and is some \$58.5 million above the President's request.

As the Members will note in the minority views that accompany the committee report, the President has acknowledged the importance of research in the mathematical and physical sciences and the other programs of the National Science Foundation by requesting healthy increases both this year and last.

The minority members of the Committee on Science and Technology oppose the authorization level in the bill as reported, and under this rule will be permitted to offer amendments to bring the bill in line with the President's request.

I urge adoption of this rule, so the House can proceed to debate the bill.

□ 1540

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 280 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4974.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4974) to authorize appropriations to the National Science Foundation for fiscal years 1985 and 1986, with Mr. WHEAT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA).

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4974 provides authorizations of appropriations for the National Science Foundation of \$1,557.5 million for fiscal year 1985 for the research and educational activities supported by the Foundation. This amount represents a \$58.5 million increase above that requested by the administration. The committee concurs with the administration's proposed allocation of funds within the Foundation budget, and therefore has not adjusted the base funding level of any research program. The budget increase recommended by the committee is an addition which the committee feels is required to establish or maintain key programs in advanced scientific computing, graduate research fellowships, to stimulate competitive research, and strengthen information sciences. Even with these increases the committee action is less than NSF's request to the Office of Management and Budget.

Of the add-on, \$40 million will be used to increase the initial funding for the advanced scientific computing program. This program, designed to supply academic science and engineering researchers with access to powerful computing resources, allows for advances in science and technology now stalemated by the lack of access to large-scale computing or supercomputers. This initiative will also stimulate our high technology industry. U.S. industries, under increasing competition from abroad, rely upon a strong science and technology base and a worldwide market demand for its products and services. In this respect, the National Science Founda-

tion's efforts to stimulate innovation play a key role.

Another key component of the basic foundation of U.S. science and technology is its manpower. It is vitally important that the Nation continue a strong investment in the maintenance of high quality scientific and engineering personnel. To this end, the committee has included an additional \$8 million for graduate research fellowships, bringing the total to \$29 million. These moneys will allow for greater numbers of awards and an increase in the cost-of-education allowance for each fellowship. Also, the increase reflects the request the National Science Foundation made to the Office of Management and Budget in this area for the fiscal year 1985 budget.

Within the research directorates, we have, again this year, increased funding for the behavioral, social, and information sciences by \$5 million to bring them nearer the 1980 funding levels. Over the last several years, funding cuts, followed by only small increases have greatly decreased the amount of worthy research that can be supported in these areas. Much of this work is essential to understanding economic trends and problems in our increasingly information-driven society.

Funding for the experimental program to stimulate competitive research (EPSCoR) has been restored to \$3 million to allow for the program's continuation. Designed to more evenly distribute Federal funding for research among the States, EPSCoR has allowed many participating States to more successfully compete for Federal research funds from all agencies. Continued funding will let other States take advantage of this opportunity.

Finally, we have increased the research improvement in the minority institutions program by \$2.5 million to a total of \$5 million. Reflecting demographic changes, language has also been included which directs NSF to make these funds available to universities which educate a large number of minority groups, including not only blacks but also Hispanics, American Indians, and Asian Americans.

The committee's authorization bill also includes an amendment to the National Science Foundation Organic Act of 1950, which provides technical changes already reflected by the Foundation's support of fundamental engineering research. This amendment was carefully considered in subcommittee and full committee hearings, and is supported by a variety of prominent professional and academic organizations. The committee expects the amendment to emphasize and strengthen support for both basic scientific and fundamental engineering research within the Foundation.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call particular attention to the importance of the

\$40 million we have added for the advanced scientific computing initiative. Supercomputers have become an essential tool in solving the complex problems vital to our defense, economic, and scientific interests. There is clear evidence that the lack of access to large-scale computing resources limits progress in many aspects of science and engineering. The Science and Technology Committee chose to authorize an additional \$40 million for the coming fiscal year for this new initiative, in order to begin a viable and sustainable program. An effective large-scale computing program involves not only developing supercomputer centers, but also the support of a wide-reaching network, local university computer support, software development and researcher access to each new generation of machines. Initial funding must allow for the implementation of all the vital program components. Based on the sound advice of NSF's supercomputing advisory committees and from the input from the scientific community, private sector, and other Federal agencies, we are confident that these funds represent a necessary first and will be spent wisely. In coming years, we expect that this program will have developed into an integral part of the scientific enterprise carried on by the NSF.

In summary, our recommendations for the Foundation provide support for all areas of basic science and engineering research. Emphasis is placed on a new initiative to develop an advanced scientific computing program necessary to stimulate economic growth, advance the frontiers of science and technology, and enhance the education of our future scientists and engineers. The 17-percent increase over last year's budget represents the Science and Technology Committee's commitment to insuring the continued vitality and health of university science and engineering research and education.

For the use of all Members, I have included in my statement the summary from Committee Report No. 98-642 accompanying H.R. 4974.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As the ranking minority member of the Science, Research and Technology Subcommittee of the Committee on Science and Technology, I would like to commend my fellow committee members, and especially the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALGREN) for their expedient action in bringing the annual authorization bills to the floor. Particularly under the leadership of the gentleman from Florida, DON FUQUA, and the ranking Republican, the gentleman from Kansas, LARRY WINN, we have worked diligently to

iron out differences with these bills wherever possible.

To date, the House has acted on three such pieces of legislation: the fiscal year 1985 authorizations for NASA, NOAA, and EPA. This week, the House will consider what we are considering today, which is H.R. 4974, the fiscal year 1985 NSF authorization bill, and H.R. 5172, the fiscal year 1984 and 1985 NBS authorization bill. Finally, the DOE bill, which was reported to the House, is awaiting a rule.

As is frequently the case with the Science Committee, differences between members rest more so with appropriate levels of spending rather than opposition to programs or initiatives. Such is the case with this bill that we are considering today. The administration, despite the national deficit problems, has requested a 32-percent increase in funding for NSF since fiscal year 1982. I wish to emphasize that fact. In 1984, the request was an 18-percent increase; and in 1985, the request was a 13.6-percent increase. That is a tremendous increase for any agency in these times of fiscal stringency.

Many Members, and certainly constituents of mine, ask why such an increase has come from an administration committed to holding down Federal spending and balancing the budget. The answer is clear and, I believe, admirable. The answer is that our national strength and integrity are closely linked to a solid support for basic and applied science and engineering research and education.

The National Science Foundation is one agency with a unique capability of promoting such excellence and innovation in all fields of science and engineering through its support to colleges, universities, and individual investigators, graduate students, minority institutions, Nobel Prize winners, and notable scientific and engineering organizations and think tanks.

In fiscal year 1983, NSF's basic research obligations accounted for 16 percent of the total Federal support of basic research and nearly 25 percent of the total Federal support for such research at academic institutions.

In the past 4 years, Congress received requests for significant increases for NSF-supported research and equipment, instrumentation, and facilities received a 100-percent increase between 1982 and 1984, and an additional 20 percent is requested in 1985.

□ 1550

Major emphasis has been placed on the precollege education role of NSF to facilitate an increase in quality science instruction for the young of our Nation. Centers for cross-disciplinary research in engineering, accounting for \$10 million new initiative for 1985, have been proposed to integrate teach-

ing of engineering practices for undergraduate and graduate students through research experience and close interaction with industry.

For 1985, researchers at predominantly undergraduate institutions may receive increased support, from \$36.8 million to \$42.4 million, while at the same time graduate research fellowship funds have been proposed for increase. Since last year, the Foundation has reorganized its computing resources to accommodate an ever-increasing demand for research on conventional and parallel processing, software, and software needs. Increased supercomputer time has been made available to individual researchers, and the fiscal year 1985 request contains two proposals to further advance this need. A \$20 million effort to increase computer time, networking demands, and local linkage is also included. Also the National Center for Atmospheric Research will receive an additional supercomputer in fiscal year 1985.

In all, Mr. Chairman, it is unfair to say that the administration has been anything less than receptive. Rather, it has been extremely generous to the needs of the science and engineering research communities.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscal year 1985 Presidential request. I do, however, oppose H.R. 5974 which we are considering today because it has increased rather significantly the funding levels requested by the President which, as I noted before, under the President's proposal, represented an approximately 33-percent increase over the last 2 years. At the appropriate time, I intend to offer an amendment to reestablish that requested 32-percent increase in funding for fiscal year 1985, and I urge the support of that amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology, the gentleman who is responsible for getting this bill through all the hearings and to the committee and on to the floor. He has done a great job and has shown great dedication to this task. I am very happy to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALGREN).

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman I thank the gentleman very much, and I certainly appreciate those kind words. I want to emphasize, too, that every member of our subcommittee and also of the full committee has contributed a great deal to bringing this authorization to the level of consensus that it has received and to the shape that it is in presently. I think that that credit goes to the Committee on Science and Technology as a whole. Certainly ev-

eryone in the science community knows of the particular interest of the chairman of the full committee in this subject, and so there is a lot of credit to go around.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to encourage support for this authorization as it is reported by the committee. I think we should pause to consider how important the National Science Foundation is and what a substantial role it plays in the investment which we must make together really as a Government, because there is no other source of support for truly basic research. We should recognize how important this function is for our Nation as a whole.

The National Science Foundation is literally the lifeblood of our Nation's academic community, including 2,300 universities and colleges. Thousands of faculty, undergraduates, and graduate students depend on the financial resources made available by the Foundation.

We should also pause to remember that the National Foundation is the only agency in our society that has responsibility—responsibility delegated to it directly by the Congress and by law for the health of American science and engineering. And in that sense, although other funds flow to science and engineering from other mission agencies, no other agency sits down and looks itself in the eye and tries to meet the broad responsibility for the health of science in each of its various forms.

As such, the National Science Foundation makes an absolutely critical contribution to the health of this country, both in defense, in the basic defense, and also particularly in the economic sense, now that we are moving so rapidly into an international economy and an international economy that is so dependent on technology and advances in science for economic growth.

This is an area where we truly cannot afford to be stingy. It represents our Nation's investment in our future.

In view of the importance of the National Science Foundation to the national interest, the Committee on Science and Technology has recommended a 4-percent increase in the authorization for fiscal year 1985 for the National Science Foundation over and above the administration's request. Most of this increase will support the initiation of a new advanced scientific computing program, an initiative in supercomputers that is truly critical to the future of our economy. That accounts for literally \$40 million out of the \$58 million that was added by the committee over and above the administration's recognition of the effort that we ought to make in this area. The remainder of the increase is targeted to restore and upgrade ongoing

National Science Foundation programs which have contributed effectively and enhanced our standing in science and engineering research.

The importance of the computer initiative is widely recognized. In the Washington Post of February 7, 1984, the headline reads: "Japanese Firms Build Two of the World's Fastest Computers."

Every commission—and we have had several that have been put in the field by the National Science Foundation and by the President's science adviser—every commission has recognized the critical effort that we must make in this area, and every commission has recognized that we must do substantially more than the administration requested in its authorization. The initial review, known as the Bardon Report, found that our necessary investment would be on the level of \$180 million.

We have essentially a \$60 million initial effort in this function for supercomputers in this fiscal year which we are authorizing, and I think every reasonable view is that that is only a reasonable start on the problem.

So I think we really have to recognize the importance and legitimacy of this effort on this level in supercomputers.

Another point should be underscored, and that is the importance of our continuing efforts to support scientific and engineering personnel. At present, the United States has a severe shortage in many areas of people power, trained people power in the areas of science and technology. A contributing factor to this shortage has been the decreased Federal support for fellowships and research assistantships which have fallen from a total of 80,000 in 1969 supported by the National Science Foundation to, as I understand it, only 40,000 today. This has come at a time when the cost of education has also outdistanced the amount of individual stipends which we were provided.

I think it is instructive to compare the National Science Foundation's level of support in this area with that experienced by other mission agencies, particularly the Department of Defense. Under funding for the Department of Defense, the fellowships and the research assistants type programs have kept pace or have done substantially better in keeping pace with increased costs compared to the National Science Foundation. For example, during the first year of support under the DOD fellowships, a researcher was supplied \$13,000 in stipends and full tuition at the university that is involved, plus an award of \$2,000 that goes directly to the academic department involved. In contrast, the National Science Foundation's stipend is only \$9,000 a year, with the cost of educa-

tion allowance, rather than full tuition, being only \$4,900.

□ 1600

Therefore, the committee has attempted to add funds, some \$8 million to the National Science Foundation program to increase both the number of the fellowships and the stipends in order to make up for the cost of this kind of discrepancy.

Third, we again recognize this year that we have to do something more in the area of behavioral, social, and information sciences in order to restore them to previous levels of effort. In 1980 and 1981, the behavioral and social sciences were reduced substantially greater in percentage terms than were the other areas of interest to the National Science Foundation. At the time, I think that there was general recognition that those reductions were harmful and general recognition that particularly in the area of behavioral and social sciences lies the key to the improvement of economic productivity that this country seeks to enhance.

I can never forget listening to "Face the Nation" shortly after the present administration took office and when the president of General Motors was asked what changes were really needed in order to restore a healthy economic function of his firm, he said, "Rather than change regulations or taxes or any economic burden, if our people would just come to work half the time, we would be in pretty good shape."

I think the behavioral and social sciences have a tremendous amount to contribute to our understanding of what the best motivations are for our people and how to get the best contribution from our work force to our economic problems.

Certainly when we measure the effort given by other societies, such as Japan, we have a long way to go.

So we add a small amount, which does not as yet bring this educational and research function back to 1980 levels even on an absolute basis, but we tried to add a little bit to strengthen the administration's authorization in this area in order to recognize the importance and the legitimacy of the social and behavioral sciences.

I think the National Science Foundation deserves certainly recognition for the increasing emphasis on engineering research represented by their initiatives in the Centers for cross-disciplinary research. Engineering and science cross and blend in a way that really cannot be separated one from another and one way we can enhance the engineering function is to involve that level at each of these disciplines in a cross-disciplinary effort and that will go a long way to helping us strengthen some of the engineering capabilities we need in this country.

The committee also added language in the organic act supporting and directing the National Science Foundation effort an increased emphasis on fundamental engineering research. I think that is certainly recommendable in view of the direct contribution that engineering has to make to our engineering health and in view of the difficulty of getting adequate funding to basic engineering research. When we look at our engineering establishment, we realize there are serious shortages in the educational component, particularly on the Ph.D. and other levels, and certainly the National Science Foundation, in keeping with its responsibility for the basic scientific health of the country, has a substantial role to play there and we recognize that in the committee amendment.

I would really urge all Members to be supportive of the work product of this committee. I think there is substantial consensus on both sides of the aisle of the direction to go and for the most part the level of effort we should be giving and I hope that wide consensus is recognized by the House.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN), a member of our committee.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the full committee for yielding time to me to make a few remarks with regard to this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4974, the fiscal year 1985 National Science Foundation authorization. I congratulate the full committee and subcommittee chairmen and ranking members for their excellent work on this legislation. I was pleased with the administration's request for the National Science Foundation when it was brought before the Science and Technology Committee earlier this year. The administration request reflected a greater understanding of the importance of adequate funding for scientific research to the overall health and vitality of our country. The Science and Technology Committee made a few minor changes, and some additions, where the Members felt that some areas had been overlooked.

The committee provided \$40 million to the National Science Foundation for advanced scientific computing. Mr. Speaker, scientific computing is proving to be the key to our future. The Working Group on Computers for Research's report, "A National Computing Environment for Academic Research"—the Bardon/Curtis report—estimated the United States needed \$180 million to properly support academic supercomputing facilities. Today many U.S. science and engineering researchers must go to foreign

facilities for supercomputing. The \$20 million requested by the administration would fund only a study of our long-range computing needs. For this reason the committee requested an additional \$40 million to allow NSF to start to enhance its scientific computing program and to maintain NSF as the lead in coordinating interagency supercomputer centers and networks. The \$40 million would also make a clear statement to U.S. supercomputer companies that our Nation supports supercomputers.

Mr. Chairman, I am particularly gratified that the committee agreed to an amendment I offered in subcommittee to increase the amount available for graduate fellowships by \$8 million. This amendment will allow the Science and Engineering Education Directorate to increase the number of graduate fellowships, as well as the cost-of-education allowance. This would be a first step in increasing these stipends to a level comparable to similar Department of Defense fellowship programs. I would like to reiterate the emphasis placed in the Science Committee's NSF Report (H. Rept. 98-642) on the need for a vigorous education program relating to predominantly undergraduate institutions.

I am also pleased that the committee took favorable action on an amendment offered by distinguished colleague from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and me, regarding the role of NSF in fundamental engineering research. Following a hearing on March 21, 1984, the full committee approved a compromise amendment derived from legislation Mr. SKEEN and I introduced, H.R. 4822, which includes fundamental engineering research as an explicit activity of NSF in its charter. I would like to include two editorials on this subject appearing in this week's Science magazine by Dr. Lewis Branscomb, Chairman of the National Science Board, in answer to an earlier editorial by Dr. Frank Press, President of the National Academy of Sciences.

[From Science, Apr. 13, 1984]

AMENDING THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT

The intent of a proposal before Congress to amend the National Science Foundation Statutory Act of 1950 is to provide for a stronger emphasis on engineering in NSF programs, principally by inserting the words "engineering" or "engineers" in almost every place that "science" or "scientist" appears in the text. I fully share the concerns that prompted the suggested changes, and I have spoken to the importance of efforts to ensure our continuing technological strength, both nationally and internationally. Among the many problems we face are faculty shortages; inadequate, often outdated instruments and equipment; insufficient funding for engineering research; inefficient transfer of new scientific and engineering knowledge into public and commercial sectors; and inefficient transfer from industry

to the universities of industrial knowledge and needs.

We do have to act. That agreed, there are, in terms of the proposed amendment, several questions before us. What can effectively be done within the existing statutory framework? Are new arrangements needed, and what are their likely effects? What processes should be followed for forming new arrangements and for implementing them?

First, what can be effectively done within existing arrangements? The Administration's proposed fiscal year 1985 budget answers the question. For example, there is a substantial increase for engineering research in the NSF budget—the largest proportionate increase for any of the directorates. In addition, support for engineering is embedded in the budgets of the mission agencies, with individual agencies providing much more support than the \$147 million proposed in fiscal 1985 for engineering research within NSF. In 1984, an estimated \$786 million was provided by the federal government for basic research in engineering, most of that coming from agencies other than NSF.

Let us assume that the new arrangements of the sort suggested in the proposed revisions are adopted. What are the likely outcomes? A major change may be to dilute the fundamental mission for which NSF was created—to support basic research in all the sciences. One needs to remember that, in contrast to engineering, many of the sciences are not related to any agency's mission except NSF. Is there any assurance that, as engineering research grows within NSF, there will be commensurate growth in its overall budget? If not, what impact will competition for funds have on the sciences that depend heavily on NSF support, such as mathematics, and chemistry?

Although partitioning NSF between science and engineering is not the intent of the House Committee on Science and Technology, the wording used in the amendment can be given this unfortunate interpretation. Given the very few changes made to date in the 1950 act, can that act not, in its present form, provide for a larger role for engineering within NSF?

The science and engineering communities—academic, industrial, and governmental—should work together in a constructive way to address the problems of engineering. But one must ask whether legislative remedies will be truly effective in promoting this dialogue or may instead lead to corrosive frictions? Amendment of the NSF organic act is a serious undertaking whose consequences are uncertain. Will there be other requests to amend the act? Will we have a "discipline of the month" series of amendments, leading to the ultimate decay of one of the most successful institutions established by the federal government?

It is not clear that the changes are necessary. They may even be counterproductive. What is critical is to continue the dialogue on engineering that has been under way for several years. That dialogue has already produced substantial results. And, if conducted in a collegial manner with all parties involved, then we may fashion more effective remedies that will benefit not only engineering but also science and the federal role in research and development.—Frank Press, President, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C. 20037.

[From Science, Apr. 27, 1984]

ENGINEERING AND THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

For some years the National Science Board has been working with the directors of the National Science Foundation—in particular, Richard Atkinson, John Slaughter, and Edward Knapp—to modernize the NSF mission in support of academic engineering. With strong encouragement from the National Academy of Engineering and professional societies, and with the support of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, gratifying progress has been made. The Engineering Directorate has been established, a new mission for NSF in engineering established by NSB, and new program directions established by the NSF director.

All this has been accomplished within the framework of the NSF Act, which, as Frank Press points out in his editorial (April 13), does not require amendment to permit this. Nevertheless, the consensus of the NSB is that the amendments proposed by the House Committee on Science and Technology are reasonable and constructive. Engineering would no longer be defined as a scientific discipline. At the same time NSF's role would be support for programs "... fundamental to the engineering process and programs to strengthen engineering research potential and engineering education. . . ."

This proposed new phrasing should help put to rest two concerns that have bothered both scientists and engineers. Engineering is seen as more than science. We should not say to engineers, "You can receive support only if your work competes as science." Such pressures in the past have hurt U.S. engineering, have hurt the economy, and have not helped science. The phrasing also emphasizes the academic and research orientation of NSF support and makes clear that NSF will not do the engineering work of other agencies or engage in commercially oriented problem-solving.

For these reasons, I do not share Press' concern about the "likely outcomes" of adoption of the proposed amendments. His main concerns are that (i) NSF's fundamental mission will be diluted and (ii) the engineering budget will grow at the expense of science. On the first point, the fundamentals of engineering are being defined and their educational linkages strengthened. On the second, there is a way for science to lose but also a way for both science and engineering to gain.

If we insist that engineering is only another discipline of science, like physics or anthropology, all the pressures to modernize American engineering in the interests of national security and economic competitiveness will be played out in a fixed-pie scenario—one discipline against another. Or, if this process frustrates those concerned with upgrading our national engineering capability to the point that they abandon NSF as a significant participant in the effort, it will lead to a National Technology Foundation or some other new federal structure to do the job. Much of the political support enjoyed by fundamental science today might well be bled off into the support for the budget of such an agency, which would focus the majority of its work on near-term benefits. Growth in the budget for science could be a major casualty. So too would be much of the fruitful interchange between science and engineering, which is best promoted with a single agency incorporating both.

Engineers should help NSF refine the research and education strategy that best fulfills the NSF mission in engineering and should support the study of engineering research priorities now under way at the NAE. Industry needs to understand how well its interests are served by a supportive but non-intrusive NSF program and help NSF get the additional resources it deserves. Scientists should welcome the development of new NSF initiatives that build an ever stronger case for the economic importance of basic science through an effective engineering capability that can deliver added benefits to the American people.—Lewis M. Branscomb, Chairman, National Science Board, Washington, D.C. 20550.

Mr. Chairman, both the west and the east coast experienced earthquakes within the last several days. Yesterday's San Francisco, CA, earthquake registered 6.2 on the Richter scale. Sunday night, a moderate earthquake was experienced from Washington, DC, to New York. The Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act, signed into law by the President on March 22, 1984, includes authorization of the National Science Foundation, as well as the National Bureau of Standards, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and the Department of the Interior. In the interest of simplicity, I understand that the chairman of the committee will offer a technical amendment to clarify the intent of the committee not to provide "double authorization" for the earthquake programs. Since the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act has already been signed by the President, this should have no adverse effect on the programs. However, this action should not be construed as a reduced commitment of the committee for the earthquake research support provided by NSF. I would like to include for the RECORD an article appearing in Newsweek regarding the earthquake threat in an area of the United States not usually thought of as earthquake prone, but which suffered one of the most severe earthquakes in written history, New Madrid, MO. I also include a Los Angeles Times article on the recent San Francisco earthquake.

[From Newsweek, Apr. 30, 1984]

QUAKING IN THE MIDWEST?

During the winter of 1811-12 the small Missouri town of New Madrid was devastated by three of the most powerful earthquakes ever to jolt the North American continent. Three times the land heaved and rocked like a roller coaster gone berserk. Trees and buildings collapsed like so many matchsticks, the flow of the mighty Mississippi actually reversed and church bells in distant Boston rang from the shock. Each quake was followed by a series of aftershocks, leaving the ground trembling "like the flesh of a beef just killed," according to one account.

Scars on the landscape still provide reminders of those giant temblors, which may have reached an awesome 8.7 on the Richter scale, and the 3,200 present inhabitants of New Madrid are accustomed to the rumblings of minor subterranean indigestion. But since 1895, when a moderate tremor

(about magnitude 6) struck, the region has been relatively quiet. Too quiet. Geologists have identified the smoking gun—a fault created some 500 million years ago when the continent almost ripped apart—and they have known for years that the gun is being loaded again with underground pressure. While gigantic earthquakes seem to occur in the area about every 600 years, smaller but still potentially dangerous tremors have hit every 40 to 80 years, making a quake overdue. "There is a high disaster potential," explains geophysicist Otto Nuttli of St. Louis University. The warnings have finally set bureaucratic wheels turning; last week the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) granted \$300,000 to a seven-state consortium that is struggling to predict—and prepare for—the aftermath of a big shock.

NATURAL DISASTER

The consortium's conclusions will undoubtedly echo what scientists have already said: a repeat of the 1811-12 quakes would cause the worst natural disaster in U.S. history. In at least seven states, buildings would topple, bridges would collapse and pipelines would break. The result would be widespread devastation, roaring firestorms, billions of dollars in damages and thousands of deaths. It would be, Nuttli has said, "a disaster whose magnitude would only be eclipsed by an all-out nuclear war."

One major problem has been that few building codes acknowledge the threat of massive temblors. Architects have successfully argued that because quakes happen so infrequently in the Midwest compared with California, buildings need not meet stricter California standards for earthquake-proofing. The seven-state consortium, FEMA hopes, will be able to change the codes so that when the big one comes, a few buildings might remain standing.

The shadow hanging directly over their town, however, does not seem to faze the residents of New Madrid. Mayor James Cravens sells T shirts emblazoned with the gallows-humor slogan, "Visit New Madrid (While It's Still There)," and L. H. Recker, editor, publisher and owner of the New Madrid Weekly Record, professes indifference. "The predictions are so far-fetched," he complains. "Most people here don't give it a thought."

[From the Los Angeles Times, Apr. 25, 1984]

MAJOR QUAKE ROCKS NORTHERN PART OF STATE

(By Jerry Belcher and Eric Malnic)

A major earthquake rocked vast reaches of Northern California Tuesday, injuring at least a dozen people, jolting homes off their foundations and touching off a number of fires.

The quake's epicenter was 12 miles east of San Jose and registered 6.2 on the Richter scale, according to seismologists at the University of California, Berkeley.

Most of the damage and injuries occurred in and around the farming town of Morgan Hill, 10 miles southeast of San Jose.

The city of San Jose also was heavily jolted by the quake, which struck at 1:15 p.m., and two major fires broke out within minutes of the initial shock. Seismologists said the quake, followed by a series of aftershocks, was centered on the Calaveras Fault.

SKYSCRAPERS SWAY

A crack opened in the roadway atop Anderson Dam, five miles east of San Jose, and upstream gates were immediately closed,

but a spokeswoman for the state Office of Emergency Services said there apparently was no immediate danger.

Skyscrapers in San Francisco swayed alarmingly. In Berkeley and Oakland, many workers fled into the streets. In Fremont, at least one high school was evacuated, with about 2,000 youngsters dashing for open spaces.

"It swayed so much I thought I was on a horse," said rancher Rex Lindsay, who lives on Mt. Hamilton, east of San Jose, virtually on the epicenter of the temblor.

"It is chaos here," said a Morgan Hill policeman. Another police officer said there were 12 people injured in the town of 16,000, none of them seriously, and that nine buildings were damaged, three so badly they had to be condemned. In addition there were several fires, but the officer said he could not estimate how bad the situation was.

"Most of the damage has been in the Morgan Hill and San Martin area," reported Mary McLellen, director of disaster services for the Santa Clara Valley Red Cross in San Jose.

She said several children at Raymond Gwinn Elementary School were injured by falling objects. "There are maybe a dozen injuries reported," she said.

McLellen said first reports indicate several homes were damaged in San Martin and in Jackson Oaks, near the Anderson Dam.

"We're ready to open a shelter if the need exists," the Red Cross official said. "We have a team going to the south county to assess damage now."

Jane Decker of the Santa Clara County Office of Emergency Services said that "considering the magnitude of the quake we don't seem to be faced with a lot of major damage." She also reported that the Morgan Hill area seemed hardest hit.

ELECTRICAL POWER OUT

The quake knocked out electrical power in several parts of Northern California, but most was restored within a matter of minutes. However, there were reports that electricity was out all around Morgan Hill. Telephone communications in and out of Morgan Hill also were disrupted for a time. Decker also said the quake reportedly set off fires in a garage in an East San Jose shopping center, causing an estimated \$1 million damage. Another fire caused heavy damage to a San Jose restaurant.

Thomes McEvilly, professor of seismology at UC Berkeley, said the temblor, at 6.2 on the Richter scale, "was a major earthquake." There were four or five aftershocks in the range of 3.5 to 4 within the next two hours, McEvilly said.

TWO ROLLING JOLTS REPORTED

"If it (the epicenter) had been in a built-up area it would have done a lot of damage," McEvilly said.

The San Francisco earthquake of 1906—the 78th anniversary of that disaster was observed only last Thursday—was rated at 8.3 on the Richter Scale. The Coalinga earthquake on May 2, 1983, which virtually wiped out the town's business center, registered 6.7.

Most people reported Tuesday's temblor as two rolling jolts.

"I felt it as two big jerks," said Lotus Bakes, a clerk at the Lick Observatory near the epicenter. "Everybody dashed out of the building," she said. "Dishes were broken. Things fell off shelves."

A large boulder jolted loose by the quake rolled down a hill and slammed into a car

that Bakes' husband was working on. She said he wasn't hurt.

In San Francisco's landmark Tadich's Grill, manager Chris Sentovich said the quake "startled" late luncheon patrons. But he added, "when it was over, they clapped. The chef didn't spill a drop of food."

"I was standing there (doing the dishes) and all of a sudden the doors started shaking," said South San Francisco housewife Lee Brian. "It wasn't sharp, but it just kept going. At first I thought . . . is my house blowing away? The cat ran into the garage. . . . I'd been thinking about canceling my earthquake insurance. Now maybe I won't."

San Francisco advertising executive Jennifer Wilkinson was convinced she was about to die. She was on the second floor of a downtown building. "It was incredible," she recalled. "I saw the Venetian blinds jumping up and down. In all my life in the Bay Area I've never felt an earthquake. This time I thought . . . 'I'm going to die.'"

In San Jose, City Hall and Santa Clara County Hall of Administration workers fled into the street. Elevators in the buildings automatically shut down, and about a dozen people were trapped inside for a time.

There were reports of pictures knocked from walls, chandeliers swinging wildly, plaster falling and merchandise and dishes jolted from shelves throughout much of the area.

"It was the worst," said Mary Guglielmo, owner of the Plateau 7 Restaurant, atop a seven-story building in San Jose. She said wine bottles toppled from shelves and a small tree fell over. "It just went on and on," she said.

In Minden, Nev., Douglas County Librarian Connie Brashear said the jolt "moved some shelving . . . caused plants to wave back and forth, swayed the building and woke up one of our cats."

In Martinez, 35 miles east of San Francisco, Nel Veder said it was the strongest she'd felt in 15 years. "Cupboards rattled, chandeliers swayed. It was a long rolling quake of about 20 seconds duration."

California's last significant earthquake was on Jan. 22, when a temblor centered on the Monterey Peninsula hit 5.25 on the Richter scale. The Richter scale is a gauge of energy released by an earthquake as measured by ground motion recorded on seismographs. Each higher number on the scale represents a tenfold increase in energy released.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Science and Technology Committee bill.

□ 1610

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. FLIPPO), a former member of the Science and Technology Committee.

Mr. FLIPPO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALGREN) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) for their work and leadership in bringing this measure to the House floor. All the Members of the House should be pleased and proud of the work and leadership all the members of the Committee of Science and Technology are providing in developing national goals, policies, and programs to maintain the leader-

ship of our country in science and technology.

H.R. 4974 deserves the support of every Member of this body. The bill carefully balances the national need to invest in basic research with the requirement for Federal fiscal responsibility. This measure prudently establishes research priorities and the allocation of funds in the bill accurately reflects national goals and objectives.

Mr. Chairman, I want to direct my remarks in support of one area of the NSF budget that is of interest to me and I am sure most of my colleagues. For some years I have been interested in seeing a wider development of scientific talent and of centers of excellence across the country, and a more equitable distribution of Federal funds to support such development.

The awarding of Federal grants on the basis of quality and technical merit insures that only first-rate research will be supported. This is sound policy insuring that the investment of Federal revenues will yield the highest returns. We must recognize, however, that this policy also tends to perpetuate the uneven distribution of research capability throughout the country. Of the total Federal budget for fundamental research spent on college campuses, the bulk of the funds are distributed to those campuses in the States with the highest level of funding. For example, this year 60 to 65 percent of available Federal research dollars have been allocated to campuses in 10 States where the support for higher education is the highest, while only 1 to 2 percent went to schools in the 10 States where funding is lowest.

The National Science Foundation has, at the urging of the Committee on Science and Technology and many other Members of the House, given some attention to this problem.

For the last 5 years NSF has been operating the experimental program to stimulate competitive research (EPSCoR). This program was designed to first, increase the capability of scientists and engineers in States that have been relatively less successful in competing for Federal R&D funds; and to second, encourage a wider distribution of scientific talent, and Federal funds.

Under the EPSCoR program NSF awarded \$2.5 million to \$3 million each year from fiscal year 1981 through fiscal year 1984 to universities in five States that were among the lowest in total Federal research funding. The awards were made to help support statewide research improvement plans, and the five States chosen were Arkansas, Maine, Montana, South Carolina, and West Virginia.

The EPSCoR is scheduled to end this year. Fortunately, the members of the Committee on Science and Technology saw fit to reauthorize this pro-

gram in H.R. 4974. This was a wise decision on the part of the committee. The program has been successful yielding great benefits to the country.

A report by NSF in October 1983, midway through the program, showed that while the change in the rank-order of States participating in the EPSCoR program was not dramatic, a number of results were noted. These include:

The quality of the faculty in participant institutions had been improved;

Over one-half of the 183 EPSCoR-supported scientists had already received other Federal awards;

Interaction between scientists in participant States and nationally recognized scientists had increased significantly;

Participant scientists were getting increased exposure, and research productivity had been increased; and

In all participating States, internal communication between scientists, administrators, legislators, and the community had been improved.

In a recent Science editorial, Prof. Gary A. Strobel, who has directed the EPSCoR program at Montana State University, highlights a number of achievements made at this university under the program. He states that well over 50 percent of the original EPSCoR investigators have acquired extramural research funds from Federal, State, and private organizations and agencies—in amounts which nearly double those originally received from NSF. Dr. Strobel says that after NSF funding has ceased, the program will continue with State funding.

Looking at the record of what has been accomplished with a relatively small investment of funding under this NSF program, it seems to me it is an emphasis worth continuing.

I feel this is important not only because it enables these less-than-top funded institutions to compete for Federal research dollars, but because it enhances our total research base, improves undergraduate education in science in these locations, and provides better graduate education.

It seems to me that in these times, when our Nation is struggling to keep its leadership in science, high quality centers of excellence need to be encouraged in all areas of the country and scientific talents developed and used wherever they are available.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4974 is a sound piece of legislation. I urge my colleagues to vote for the bill.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Montana (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4974, the National Science Foundation reauthorization bill. The National Science Foundation provides support for basic research, primarily through

grants to colleges and universities. These funds are essential in helping our current scientists and future scientists address the needs of our country.

Of those areas of scientific research funded by the National Science Foundation, I believe that the behavioral and social science programs are of special importance in providing essential information that can be used to improve the quality of American life in such areas as education, health, and economic stability. This includes research on how our children learn and how we can teach them to grasp complicated concepts in such important subjects as mathematics and science. The Nation has placed a special emphasis on improving the education system in this country, and by strongly supporting this type of research on teaching and learning, we can insure a healthier educational system.

I strongly support H.R. 4974, and am particularly pleased to see that this bill increases funding for behavioral and social science programs by \$3.6 million. This increase will assist in preserving the quality of behavioral and social science research, which affects all our citizens.

● Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, as we consider H.R. 4974, the fiscal year 1985 reauthorizations for the National Science Foundation (NSF), I would like to offer my support for the addition of funds for the biological, behavioral and social sciences (BBS) directorate of NSF. For the past several years, funding for the behavioral and social science research programs within BBS has been inconsistent and has fallen behind the strong pace of other NSF research programs.

This trend is continued in the administration's budget request for fiscal year 1985, where many of the behavioral and social science programs would barely keep pace with inflation. In contrast, an overall 14-percent increase is proposed for NSF's research programs.

The disparate funding for these sciences jeopardizes progress in areas of research that have implications for any enterprise where humans are involved. Some examples are the workplace, where human efficiency and productivity are primary concerns; energy use at home and in industry; science education; aviation, where safety often depends on human performance; and the health care system, where disease prevention and health care promotion efforts are often a matter of developing healthy behavior.

I am proud to represent two academic institutions that conduct NSF-supported research: The University of Connecticut, Storrs Campus, and Wesleyan University. Together, these schools received more than \$125,000 in fiscal year 1983 (\$110,421 University of Conn.; \$24,790 Wesleyan University)

for research in neurobiology, economics, history, and psychobiology, among others. I am quite familiar with the high quality of the work being done in both universities and would decry any attempt to slow their research efforts in these important fields. That is why I urge my colleagues—many of whom represent institutions receiving NSF support for behavioral and social science research—to support the improved funding for these sciences that is contained in H.R. 4974.●

● Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against this bill, not because of any problem with the focus or function of the National Science Foundation, but merely because it is an unacceptable increase in spending at a time of deficit crisis.

The committee has brought us a bill that increases funding for NSF by about 18 percent. If we allowed increases of that magnitude to every worthy function, we would add another \$85 billion to our deficit in 1 fiscal year alone.

No function of Government can be allowed such an increase as this. I have no choice except to vote "no."●

● Mr. McCURDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to add my wholehearted support to this authorization bill, because it will inject new strength into many excellent National Science Foundation programs.

I want to focus on sections of the bill that deals with the science and engineering programs administered through NSF. The proposed funding will give the Foundation an active role in helping to overcome a key problem: Our children are not acquiring the knowledge and skills they need in today's technological world.

Substantial amounts of advanced technology research are now being conducted in Oklahoma by both the public and private sectors. I am interested in seeing that we have competent and productive workers to fill these jobs. The NSF role—although only a portion of the Federal involvement in education—adds credibility and a sense of direction to science and engineering education programs.

The emphasis this bill places on computers and education is also commendable. A strong NSF computing effort will support increased services for science and engineering university researchers and help the budding role of computers in precollege classrooms.

I am pleased that this bill reflects many of the initiatives set forth in H.R. 1310 passed by the House early last year. H.R. 1310 puts emphasis on the need for comprehensive teacher training to improve instruction in science, math, and foreign languages, but the other body has yet to act on it. I cannot emphasize too strongly my desire to see these programs implemented.

There are few causes as worthy of our precious budget dollars as an investment in the minds of our young people. I urge my colleagues to support this authorization bill.●

● Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state the importance of scientific research and technology in modern society and the need to maintain the strong U.S. position in these areas.

Although I am unable to support H.R. 4974, the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1985, due to the additional \$58.5 million increase over the President's requests, I offer my support for the advanced scientific computing concerns contained in this legislation.

The rapid advances in information and communications technology has enhanced the opportunity and need to coordinate and integrate research and development of the supercomputer. If we are to maintain economic growth and productivity, and remain competitive in the international market, we must address the needs of the U.S. supercomputer users and developers.

The Government has supported the U.S. computer industry since its inception. It is our responsibility to continue the progress of the computer industry, and insure the U.S. continued leadership in this technology which is vital to scientific advances and our national security.

Within the realm of fiscal responsibility, I state my support for the promotion of the supercomputer technology insuring the competitive edge of the U.S. science and national security.●

● Mr. MOODY. Mr. Chairman, today's debate on H.R. 4974, the fiscal year 1985 authorizing legislation for the National Science Foundation (NSF) involves several important issues relating to Federal support of research. It is essential that we not overlook the impact that this legislation will have outside the scientific community as well. I am referring specifically to the improvements proposed in H.R. 4974 for NSF's behavioral and social science research programs. H.R. 4974 would help offset the pattern of inadequate funding that has been the case for these programs for the last several years.

Behavioral and social science research addresses the human elements of a variety of problems that are of concern to this Nation. This research ranges from investigations in the physiological aspects of behavior to the measurement of socioeconomic phenomena, and is conducted in a wide variety of disciplines, including neuroscience, psychobiology, perception and memory, economics, anthropology, linguistics, and sociology.

Two institutions in my district—the University of Wisconsin and Mar-

quette University—conduct topnotch, rigorous research in each of these disciplines as well as in other behavioral and social sciences. In fiscal year 1983, the NSF directorate of biological, behavioral and social sciences (BBS) awarded well over \$200,000 in behavioral and social science research support to these schools.

Knowing this, I am concerned that the fiscal year 1985 budget request for NSF once again offers only second-class treatment to most of NSF's behavioral and social science research activities. The small increase of \$5 million for BBS that is included in H.R. 4974 would go a long way toward restoring the beleaguered budget for these sciences and would allow them to operate with greater vitality than they have experienced in recent years.

For these reasons, I would urge my colleagues in the House to approve the modifications to the fiscal year 1985 budget of NSF that are proposed in H.R. 4974 and, in particular, urge your support of the much-needed addition for behavioral and social science research.●

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. KASTENMEIER). All time has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the reported bill shall be considered as an original bill for purposes of amendment, and each section shall be considered as having been read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Science Foundation Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1985".

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to section 1?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 2.

The text of section 2 is as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year 1985 the sums set forth in the following categories:

(1) Mathematical and Physical Sciences, \$416,710,000.

(2) Engineering, \$147,100,000.

(3) Biological, Behavioral, and Social Sciences, \$258,120,000.

(4) Astronomical, Atmospheric, Earth, and Ocean Sciences, \$373,480,000.

(5) Antarctic Research Programs, \$115,080,000.

(6) Scientific, Technological, and International Affairs, \$52,400,000.

(7) Program Development and Management, \$70,902,000.

(8) Science and Engineering Education, \$83,700,000.

(b) In addition to the sums authorized by subsection (a), not more than \$40,000,000 (over and above the \$20,000,000 available for Advanced Scientific Computing in subsection (a)) is authorized to be appropriated for

the fiscal year 1985 for Advanced Scientific Computing.

(c) Of the amount authorized under subsection (a)(3), not less than \$73,880,000 shall be available to the Behavioral and Neural Sciences Division and the Social and Economic Sciences Division, and not less than \$8,000,000 shall be available to the Information Science and Technology Division.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FUQUA

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FUQUA: On page 2, line 6, strike \$147,100,000 and insert in lieu thereof, \$127,150,000, and

On page 2, line 10, strike \$373,480,000 and insert in lieu thereof, \$364,765,000, and

On page 3, after line 3, add a new subsection (d) to read as follows:

(d) Program funds for earthquake research in addition to amounts for related programs which are authorized under subsections (a)(2) and (a)(4) have been provided separate authorization of \$28,665,000 under Public Law 98-241, the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act.

Mr. FUQUA (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, funds for Federal earthquake programs have in previous years been included in the NSF authorization bill as well as the national earthquake hazards reduction authorization bill to insure that this important program is authorized. In fiscal year 1985, funds for earthquake research were again included in both bills.

On March 22, the Science and Technology Committee ordered the NSF authorization bill reported. On the same day, the President signed the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act (Public Law 98-241) into law. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, since the earthquake research program at NSF has already been authorized for fiscal year 1985 in Public Law 98-241, the amendment eliminates the double authorization.

The Committee on Science and Technology wishes to insure, in coming fiscal years, that the important earthquake research is continued as an integral part of the NSF program. Therefore, the committee will expect NSF to continue to request funds for this program in future fiscal years. As in the situation this year, the committee will consider appropriate action to provide one authorization depending on the progress of the two bills which authorize earthquake programs.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I think it is appropriate that we do delete this language.

I would like to note, however, that this is not a reduction in the authorization level of the NSF from the levels the committee passed under this bill because of the fact that we had a double authorization here. Therefore, I know the chairman has mentioned it, but I do not think anyone who is listening should feel that there is any reduction in funding levels as a result of this amendment being passed.

The funding levels remain at the same level which, as I mentioned before, we intend to offer an amendment to reduce.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. FUQUA

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I offer several amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. FUQUA: On page 4, line 22, strike the dash.

On page 4, line 23, strike the "(1)".

On page 4, line 24, strike everything after "explanation", and insert a period.

On page 5, strike lines 1 through 4.

□ 1620

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent that we go to section 7 for the purpose of considering these amendments?

Mr. FUQUA. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment to clarify the report and wait provisions in the bill. The language being removed by the amendment from the bill was written as a convenience to the executive branch, but we have learned they do not wish to see it retained in the bill. So, therefore, I am asking its deletion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA).

The amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to section 2?

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. GREGG

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. GREGG: On page 2, line 8, strike "\$258,120,000" and insert in lieu thereof \$253,120,000".

On page 2, line 13, strike "\$52,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof \$46,900,000".

On page 2, line 17, strike "\$83,700,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$75,700,000".

On page 2, strike lines 18 through 25 and renumber the remaining lines accordingly.

On page 3, strike lines 1 through 3 and renumber the remaining lines accordingly.

On page 5, strike lines 1 through 4 and renumber the remaining lines accordingly.

Mr. GREGG (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent the amendment be considered en bloc, considered as read, and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

Mr. FUQUA. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, and I do not intend to, is the gentleman's amendment the same amendment that he provided before the debate began?

Mr. GREGG. Will the gentleman yield, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Yes, it is.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I also ask unanimous consent that that section of this amendment which amends section 3 be allowed, that it be made in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman requests that the amendment be made in order for section 7?

Mr. GREGG. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I ask unanimous consent it be made in order relative to section 7.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FUQUA. Has not section 7 previously been amended by the amendment just agreed to?

Mr. GREGG. I believe the chairman of the committee is correct on that. I would change my request, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct; that part of the amendment has already been agreed to.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified to delete the last line of it, which begins "On page 5."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There is no objection.

The modification to the amendments offered by Mr. GREGG is as follows: Strike out "On page 5" and all that follows through the end of the amendment.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, this amendment which is offered in the spirit of strong support for the scien-

tific and engineering demands of the Nation is an amendment which brings the funding of NSF to a level which is 13.4 percent higher than last year and approximately 33 percent higher than 2 years ago.

It is, however, approximately 5 percent less than the increased funding levels proposed by the majority in the bill.

The gravamen of this issue is the supercomputer or additional supercomputer money which have been placed in the bill, which are in the bill above the President's budget levels. This is approximately \$40 million of the \$58 million, which is involved in my amendment as the difference between the majority's funding levels and my amendment's funding levels.

The reason I have reduced the supercomputer request by \$40 million is that this money simply cannot be handled by NSF at this time.

The bill has in it, as presented and not amended by myself, \$20 million for supercomputers. In addition, the NSF, with that money, the NSF is going to be able to obtain one new supercomputer. There are presently a number of supercomputers at the Federal level, 36 I believe it is, and there are, in this year being purchased, 6 more supercomputers.

The fact that the NSF is unable at this time to handle the supercomputer additional funds which have been requested by the majority was made clear not only in our testimony, I believe, before our committee, but also by Dr. Keyworth, who stated in a letter to the committee which I intend to present in the full House:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, DC, March 21, 1984.

Hon. DON FUQUA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR DON: I understand that the House Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology is planning to report out an NSF authorization bill almost \$100 million above the President's request, with \$80 million of this increase for university advanced scientific computing. It is my firm belief that a one year increase of this magnitude would be a serious misallocation of science support resources.

There have been reports in the newspapers in the past several weeks of the alleged superiority of the latest Japanese supercomputers, especially the Fujitsu VP200, compared to the current U.S. models. Our latest discussions with knowledgeable experts from both industry and academia indicate that these reports were grossly exaggerated and misleading, and that the current Cray X-MP is still the machine to beat. There is no question, however, that the U.S. industry is being challenged. We are completely sympathetic to the notion that greater university access to supercomputers will be a major factor in developing the talent and stimulating the demand for future advanced computing systems that will maintain our superiority in this field.

Nevertheless, after extensive discussions with university researchers, and with other key players, we are convinced that the uni-

versities could not effectively absorb the proposed rate of increase in supercomputer funds. It will be a year or more before the three existing university supercomputer centers are able to offer the level of support and service necessary to meet the needs of new scientific supercomputer users, especially at remote locations. We are working to increase the number of such centers, as you know, but it cannot happen overnight. Similarly, computer science departments cannot all become instant supercomputer research experts. Finally, we should not lose sight of the significant support for university supercomputer related research from other agencies, such as DOE and DARPA. I am working to establish a visible, high-level focus for coordination and prioritization of agency supercomputer related activities.

Supercomputers remain an extremely high priority on our science policy agenda. We are concerned that key areas, such as software and parallel processing may be receiving less than appropriate attention. In general I support the priorities established by the NSF Advisory Committee on Advanced Scientific Computing Resources. However, I believe that an increase of the proposed magnitude both would be wasteful and could disrupt other, equally important, scientific research initiatives within the agency.

Yours truly,

G. A. KEYWORTH,

Science Adviser to the President.

In other words, our chief science adviser at the Federal level feels rather strongly, as does the NSF's leadership, that it cannot at this time handle the moneys which are being added to an already large increase in the budget.

I think it should be noted, also, that last year we added additional funds into the NSF budget and those funds were not able to be spent on the new programs authorized, and as a result, the Appropriations Committee ended up taking moneys out of needed basic research to use in a program which did not get off the ground and therefore the basic research program suffered and the new program was not started.

I am afraid that if we go forward with this supercomputer allocation as proposed by the majority, we will end up in the same type of situation again without our desire, but in any event, effecting the research components of the NSF.

The other moneys involved in the amendment are approximately \$8 million, which was an add-on in subcommittee made by Mr. BROWN of California, which add-on was for additional graduate fellowships. Now I happen to be a very strong supporter of the elementary and secondary school education programs of the NSF and in fact feel that I have played an instrumental role in getting the NSF back into the business of helping out at the elementary and secondary school level.

These funds, these additional \$8 million, have been added on to the elementary and secondary school level; they are however for graduate school programs.

Again, I think we have a problem with that sort of funding. I do not believe that the NSF is in a position to handle the additional dollars. I am also afraid that we will again end up with the Appropriations Committee funding that \$8 million by taking money out of either basic research or possibly out of the fledgling elementary and secondary school areas which are getting off the ground and thus negatively impacting those programs.

We know there are other moneys already in this budget, significant moneys for graduate programs. In fact, the vast majority of the money spent on the NSF budget is for graduate programs.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GREGG was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. GREGG. In fact, the majority of the funds in this budget go to graduate programs and postsecondary programs. Thus, I feel that if we do anything in this funding resolution which impacts the very small amount which is now being spent on elementary and secondary school funding, the \$75 million we have in the budget out of \$1.5 billion budget, or which may impact them, we would be making a serious mistake.

There are additional funding changes in my amendment; specifically in the STIA area. We take \$5.5 million out and in the biological and behavioral science area we take another \$5 million out. These were add-on proposals which occurred over the administration's budget. I wish to stress again that this is not anywhere near a barebones budget as proposed by the administration.

We are talking about a 13.4-percent increase over this coming year on top of a significant increase in the prior year; adding up to 33 percent of increase over the last 2 years. At a time when all of us are going back to our districts and discussing deficit and how we are going to address the deficit, I believe it is very hard to justify an increase in excess of 33 percent over 2 years for one agency, no matter how valuable that agency may be and in this case, I consider it to be one of our most valuable agencies.

Everyone in this House can vote for my amendment and go back to their district and effectively present the case that they have voted for a 33-percent increase in funding for NSF over 2 years.

□ 1630

And have voted for specifically a 13.4-percent increase in funding for NSF this year and know that they have also maintained budget fiscal responsibility.

It seems to me that this is an amendment on which one can win going both ways and one which is rare in this

time of fiscal restraint to be able to have before us.

Therefore, I would ask the House Members' support for this amendment.

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge Members to think twice and maybe thrice about supporting the amendment of the gentleman from New Hampshire. I know that the amendment is offered in very good faith. But I believe that at bottom the gravamen of this amendment is an unwillingness to accept the responsibility we have in the Congress to make our own judgments about the importance and the distribution of the programs which we authorize.

I am sure the gentleman can point to support for the statement that the NSF would have difficulty consuming the funds that would be provided under this authorization.

At the same time, there is very expert opinion in support of the exact opposite conclusion. Dr. Lewis Branscomb, the Chairman of the National Science Board, testified before the Appropriations Committee that the \$20 million that we would go back to in this amendment was simply not enough money to meet a well-documented need. We know that NSF's own 1985 authorization request to OMB for supercomputers was \$47 million, more than the total provided here and over \$27 million more than the gentleman from New Hampshire would provide under his amendment.

You can go back, depending on where you start, and allege that the effort under the National Science Foundation is being increased. Part of the problem is that the decreases in certain efforts were so substantial in 1981 and 1982 that when the Congress reassessed its responsibility to make judgments about the levels of those programs, we are put in a position of asking for substantial dollar increases.

But there are two edges to that sword. The real problem goes back to those 1981 cuts. If we come to the conclusion, as I think most have, that those cuts were unwise, particularly the cuts in science education that cried out for being restored then it is incumbent on us, I believe, as the body in which the Constitution invests the responsibility to make these judgments to do the right thing. And I cannot imagine that we should risk underfunding in the area of accessing our scientific community to supercomputers.

I would ask that the amendments be rejected.

Mr. WINN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members listened carefully to the excellent statement of the gentleman from New Hampshire who is offering this amendment. I strongly support his amendment. In no way does this amendment do damage to the National Science Foundation. It simply restores the President's budget request for the coming fiscal year.

It was only a few short years ago, in the previous administration, when the budget for the National Science Foundation was about \$1 billion per year. Today, we are talking about authorizing over \$1.5 billion for the Foundation. In any era, this is substantial growth, even taking inflation into account. Given the difficult fiscal and economic situations this Nation has faced in recent years, I find the relative prosperity enjoyed by the National Science Foundation doubly extraordinary. As the gentleman from New Hampshire has pointed out, in just the past 2 years alone, the Foundation has received from the administration a requested increase of 18 percent for fiscal year 1984 and a 13.6-percent requested increase for fiscal year 1985. A more than 31-percent increase over 2 years is a much better budget increase than that enjoyed by the Department of Defense, and yet I do not hear my colleagues saying that this is excessive for NSF.

This amendment does not cut any programs in the Foundation. Adequate funding is still supplied for engineering research, advanced scientific computing, instrumentation, programs for women, minorities, and handicapped, the behavioral and social sciences, science and engineering education, and many other worthwhile programs. I know that like myself the gentleman from New Hampshire strongly supports the programs of the National Science Foundation. He proves that by the careful way that he has drafted this amendment. It will provide for vigorous and sustained growth by the Foundation, but it will do so in a fiscally responsible manner.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as has already been indicated, the gentleman from New Hampshire has made a very valuable contribution to this legislation and to the general operations of the National Science Foundation.

I find myself in agreement with many of the emphases which he has sponsored with regard to the improvement of scientific and technical education. He is quite correct about the importance of providing funding at the elementary and secondary levels and

for fellowships at the undergraduate level. His amendment, however, proposes to reduce the amount of the graduate fellowships which, as I indicated earlier and he indicated, were put in to the authorization as a result of an amendment which I offered in the subcommittee.

I, as he knows, would have preferred to offer additional funding for undergraduate fellowships and to strengthen our total scientific and technical education efforts in other ways, but we restrained ourselves in committee, although the report does give substantial support for continued initiatives by the Foundation.

Much as I respect the gentleman's effort to reduce the amount in the authorization to the level requested by the administration, I would suggest to all of the Members that this is really not the best criteria to use.

If this House insisted on adhering to the administration's requests across the board on all budgetary items, the gentleman knows that it would increase the amount of the deficit by \$30 or \$40 billion above that which the House has already approved in their budget resolution.

□ 1640

So, as a general rule, to adhere to an effort to bring all items of authorization or spending that come before us to the level of what the President has recommended would drastically increase the amount of deficit that faces this country. I know the gentleman does not propose to do that. I know he does not think he can balance the budget with the National Science Foundation's authorization, and I respect his motives. But I suggest that this is not the wisest way to proceed at this particular time. He knows the effort that was put into analyzing the need for additional support for advanced computational facilities. This was not a partisan effort in any sense of the word; it was shared by many Members of the minority. There is a feeling that we are at a critical juncture in connection with the competitive posture of this country with regard to the rest of the world in this important field. The effort that we are making to improve our posture in advanced computation is one which will contribute to the security of this country. The gentleman knows that, and I am sure that he feels that this funding can be approved later, that it is something that the administration itself will request in future years. It is the feeling of the committee—and I hope that the House will support it—that we cannot afford to procrastinate in this vital area of technological competition with the rest of the world.

That is the reason for these small, almost miniscule, increases that have been put into the authorization bill by

the committee after years of study of this situation.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire, whose views I respect very highly.

Mr. GREGG. I certainly agree with many of the representations the gentleman has made. However, I think it should be clear—and I am sure the gentleman is aware of it—that there are six new supercomputers in this budget as presented, not in this specific budget, but in the President's budget, and I think that is a fairly aggressive commitment to this type of technology by the administration.

Is the gentleman supportive of those six supercomputers?

Mr. BROWN of California. I certainly am, and I commend the administration, as I have already indicated, for the initiatives they have taken.

Mr. GREGG. And, of course, we do have in this budget as presented a 13.4-percent increase represented, and I think that again shows the administration has made a commitment here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) has expired.

(On request of Mr. GREGG and by unanimous consent, Mr. BROWN of California was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. GREGG. Does not that also show that the administration has made a commitment?

Mr. BROWN of California. That also shows a renewed commitment by this administration to the advancement of science and technology. And again I commend the administration. But I will speak further to that point.

Mr. GREGG. Well, I would just like to represent at that point that we agree on those two points, because we are talking about supercomputers and spending here, that I do not believe that this budget falls into the category of many of the other budgets the gentleman has been referring to that have come from the administration which the gentleman may have disagreement with. This budget is a little unique—it is extremely unique. It represents significant increases, it represents significant new initiatives, and I believe that we can vote for it, as amended, and still reflect the significant increases and new initiatives.

Mr. BROWN of California. If the gentleman will allow me, may I ask him a question?

Mr. GREGG. Certainly.

Mr. BROWN of California. Is it the gentleman's position that the entire budget presented by this administration is sacrosanct and that it should not be subjected to any changes?

Mr. GREGG. Well, since I voted against the defense budget last year, I would say that that being the biggest

item, I would say that was not the case.

Mr. BROWN of California. So the gentleman is not supporting every request that the administration is making in connection with their budget this year?

Mr. GREGG. If the gentleman will yield further, no. In fact, there are a number of budgets which I have not supported. But this one I think is on the right track, and that is why I am supportive of it, because of its increases and because of the new initiatives.

Mr. BROWN of California. I commend the gentleman for his pragmatic approach. I admire him, and I think he is doing the right thing, except in this particular case I think he has strayed off course for reasons which I will be glad to elaborate on further.

With regard to the position that he takes, that the 14-percent increase this year solves all of our problems or that the 33-percent increase of the last 2 years is an indication that this administration is on the right track, I would point out to the gentleman—and I am sure he is well aware of this—that we still have an fiscal year 1985 authorizing level in this bill which is approximately the same as the last budget of the Carter administration in 1981. In other words, despite the increases, they come on top of 2 years of substantial decreases which were made in this budget.

Mr. GREGG. If the gentleman will yield at that point, if we are going to bring in that Carter increase, that Carter increase I think had some mirrors, smoke, and political ramifications to it because it represented close to a 45-percent increase in 1 year in budgeting for NSF, which I do not think anybody could reasonably expect NSF could have handled in that short a timeframe.

In fact, some of the increase we put in last year NSF is going to have to lapse because of the fact that it simply cannot get the programs up in time, especially science education in elementary and secondary.

Mr. BROWN of California. I appreciate the gentleman's point. There was a belated recognition in the last year of the Carter administration that there was political gain from giving the science programs in this country what they really needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BROWN of California was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BROWN of California. I think there was a certain amount of political posturing. But from my standpoint, I do not think that that was an ill-conceived budget. And the point that I am making is that this budget merely

brings us back to the proposed budget of 4 years ago.

The gentleman certainly cannot contend that that represents a horrendous increase in the support for science and technology in this country.

I happen to honestly believe that our future as a nation, in its economic activities, its defense activities, in all of its activities, depends upon our giving support to science and technology in a reasonably generous way.

I think this budget begins to do it. It is still not as good as I would like. But because it is moving in the right direction, I have commended the administration for it, and I urge that this amendment be defeated so that we may continue on the path that we have taken.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the penultimate word.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Gregg amendment to H.R. 4974, authorizing appropriations for the National Science Foundation for fiscal years 1985 and 1986. I strongly support the leadership role the National Science Foundation is undertaking in initiating the development of an effective long-term and large-scale computing program. I believe the use of supercomputers for the advancement of many areas of science and engineering is in the national interest. It is not in the national interest, however, to increase the budget request for supercomputers \$40 million over the administration and the NSF's own advisory committee request.

And while I am on the subject of matters in the national interest, I should point out to members of the committee that as we consider this authorization, we are faced with a deficit level approaching \$200 billion for fiscal year 1985. And so Mr. Chairman, it is in the national interest that I cannot support the NSF authorization bill for fiscal year 1985 unless the amendment by Mr. GREGG is adopted by this body.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Gregg amendment.

It seems to me that this amendment goes in the right direction of finding ways in which to reduce the funding that is in the committee bill back to the level that was originally proposed by the President which, as has been mentioned here previously, was 13.5 percent more than what we spent in 1984. In 1984, we had a budget which proposed an 18-percent increase. So we have regularly increased these budgets. So we are talking about a rate of increase here which is four times what the rate of inflation is in the country.

The Gregg approach is an approach aimed at trying to assure that we do stay within some budget limits.

Now, I would say that the reason why I strongly support the Gregg amendment is because this is a targeted approach, it is an attempt to take the business of cutting back on the spending levels in this bill and targeting it in a way in which we assure that the money reduced is in a reasonable kind of area in each case.

However, I would suggest to the committee that there are other ways of cutting budgets. There are other ways of reducing authorizations. And if we cannot do it by a targeted approach, we can certainly take a look, perhaps, at untargeted approaches to reduce the levels, as well.

Now, whether or not you are for this amendment, I guess, does depend upon where you come from. If in fact you take a very narrow perspective of the world and a narrow perspective of what we do here, you can probably find reasons to accept the arguments of the gentleman from the other side. If in fact you want to focus on only this bill and you want to focus on only the things that are covered by this bill, you can say: "Oh, yes, we can justify more money here, and we can justify more money there, and we can justify more money over here." Every one of these programs is a good program. Every one of these programs has some merit to it. And if you want to be that narrow about this program, you can find reasons for supporting the increased levels of spending that are in the committee's bill.

However, if you want to take a little more broad view of national policy and recognize that we are faced with a \$175 billion deficit, I would suggest that the Gregg amendment is something you ought to take a very close look at.

Now, we cannot simply come to this floor and consistently say that the President's budget is meaningless and we ought not to look at that in this case. Virtually every argument that is made out here is in some way trying to justify the congressional budget or the President's budget, whichever is higher. Now, that is the reason why we have gotten ourselves into so much trouble down through the years.

As I mentioned during the budget debate here a couple weeks ago, when we came to this floor with a budget, we were coming out here with a phony, to begin with, because we have managed in this Congress to exceed our own budget projections over the last 5 years by \$276 billion.

□ 1650

We cannot stick within our own budgets because we are always coming out here and violating either the President's budget or our own budget, whichever happens to be the higher

figure. That is exactly what we are doing here; we are coming in here with more spending. We are coming in here with \$58 billion of spending increase over the President's budget. If we want to get the spending cut back, if we want to do something about reducing spending levels, here is a place to start, and you can do it in a very responsible way with the Gregg amendment which targets those spending cuts at various locations.

I would say that if we cannot do it by the Gregg route, we will have an opportunity then to do it by another route, and I would suggest that that may be a good deal tougher to vote against.

I would hope that the committee will assess its position and decide that the Gregg route is by far the best way to go. That this is the way in which the committee can reduce the spending back to a 13.5-percent increase and go forward from there. If we cannot do that here, than I would ask where we can do it, and my suggestion is that probably we cannot do it anywhere.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Hampshire has offered an amendment, and I am sure well intended, to do what he thinks is best in bringing this bill back to the budget request of the President. The committee and the subcommittee held numerous days of hearings under the able leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALGREN) and Mr. GREGG serves as the ranking minority member on that subcommittee, and his attendance and efforts have been very constructive in trying to bring this bill to the floor.

I think the amendment that is offered today just totally ignores some of the priorities that the members of the committee feel that should be included. One of them is to help, and it is a very small program, but to help stimulate competitive research in a lot of colleges and universities that do not participate in the NSF programs. We have some money in for research and improvement in minority institutions, a very important program.

Let us get to the most important one that the committee added funds for, and that is the \$40 million for the advanced scientific computing. Now, in this country we have over 2,000 colleges and universities. Only three of those have supercomputing capability. I will guarantee you that just about every Federal agency that wants one has one. The Department of Defense, Department of Energy, NASA, they all have them. But they use them for their own work; they are not teaching anybody; they are not doing any research in these programs that they have. Most of them are cloaked with

secrecy because of the security aspects with them. So universities have no way to participate in these programs.

Reference was made to the letter from Dr. Keyworth, the President's Science Adviser. Well, at the time that letter was written the subcommittee, and I think wisely so, had added about \$80 million to this program. There was some concern whether it could be adequately spent within this fiscal year. Dr. Keyworth addressed his letter to that figure. But I might add, in the last page of his letter, the last paragraph, he says that:

"Supercomputers remain an extremely high priority in our science policy agenda." And that, "In general I support the priorities established by the NSF Advisory Committee on Advanced Scientific Computing Resources."

Well, what did they recommend? They recommended in the course of their studies \$180 million plus be added to this program for supercomputer activities. They said then that they felt like they fell short of the need with even that amount of money. There was \$20 million in the budget, and we added \$40 million; I offered the amendment in committee to reduce it back in half. I did not do that with any great amount of pride, but I thought it was a compromise, a prudent compromise, and it would take care of some of the concerns that Dr. Keyworth had mentioned in his letter.

A member of the Grace Commission on March 30 of this year, Carl Bays, who is from the research and development task force of the Grace Commission, said, and I would like to quote, he said:

A central challenge for the government is in the maintenance of strong support for a broad range of research and development activities.

He did not end there, he went on to say:

This is not an easy challenge in time of deep concern about government budgets, but it is one that we must meet, and the government does have a clear role.

I think that we must look at what will the supercomputers be doing. Well, they will be distributing to areas where we can have low-cost, higher capability supercomputers; they will introduce advanced prototype machines for use in the university setting for training and development. Where does the Government and industry obtain the talent it needs to operate supercomputers? Where do they come from? They come from colleges and universities. Only three, only three, Mr. Chairman, in the whole United States.

Many of our scientific people and researchers are now forced to go to foreign countries in order to get supercomputer time so that they can do their work properly. The supercom-

puter industry in the United States is under very stiff competition from outside developers including the Japanese superspeed project, and some other programs in Europe. It is very vital, Mr. Chairman and the members of this committee, that we in this Congress have a responsibility to exercise our duties also as well as the executive branch.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FUQUA was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. FUQUA. This is money that will make back tenfold this investment in jobs, in knowledge, and advancement of a very important field that is very crucial to this country for our continuation as a technological leader in the late 1990's and the years after that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) has expired.

(On request of Mr. GREGG and by unanimous consent, Mr. FUQUA was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman has made the point about the three computers in the universities that presently exist, and I obviously agree with him that there are three computers, but I think that it should also be made clear, Dr. Keyworth made clear, and some of the testimony I think implies that those computers right now are not able to be used to full capacity. Because they are not set up, there is not the necessary support, to quote from Dr. Keyworth:

It will be a year or more before the three existing university supercomputer centers are able to offer the level of support and services necessary to meet the needs of the new scientific supercomputers used.

Thus, we will need more supercomputers at the university level, there is no question about that. But to add it in at this time is going to be premature, and I suspect may end up with the Appropriations Committee doing what they did to us in education last year which was to drain off some research dollars in order to stay at the 13.4-percent increase.

Mr. FUQUA. Let me say to the gentleman that we are not talking about necessarily spending all this money on buying more or new supercomputers so that we can put one in every one of the 2,000-plus colleges and universities; what we are trying to do is to advance the concept of networking the utilization and expand the frontiers of availability to the colleges and universities so that they can utilize these computers.

There may be additional uses for computers, but not a mass market for them or procurement of them. But we are trying to utilize them because the ones that are owned by the Government have very limited access to colleges and universities. We are trying to open that up, but the very sense of the programs that many of them have limits the availability to outside people doing computational work on their computers.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), a member of our committee, has made great contribution in a bill last year about networking so that we can hook up through satellites and better utilize the capacity of these machines. This is what we are talking about.

□ 1700

Mr. GREGG. If the gentleman will yield further on that point, I think the point that is being made by Mr. Knapp and is being made here by Dr. Keyworth is that they are not in a position to spend more money than they are already going to get in this budget, which has a 13.4-percent increase, in order to bring about either the new networking that would be additionally added under the gentleman's \$40 million, or to add a new computer which might be bought with this additional money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) has again expired.

(On request of Mr. GREGG and by unanimous consent, Mr. FUQUA was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GREGG. But they are pursuing the issue of Networking, they are aggressively pursuing the issue of expanding the availability of these three university systems, and are working with the three universities to do that. However, they feel they can do it without the 13.4-percent increase and they do not need an additional 5 percent here on top of an already increased budget.

Mr. FUQUA. Let me point out to the gentleman that Dr. Keyworth said he was in general support of the priorities established by the NSF Advisory Committee on Advanced Scientific Computing Resources, and they recommended \$188 million. We are way, way lower than that, and I think we are at a level that can adequately be expended in a very prudent fashion.

I would not want to ask for more money than can be spent in a prudent fashion. We want to get the value for the money and I think we are at that level. Dr. Keyworth's letter was written when we were at twice that amount in the program.

Mr. GREGG. But, if the gentleman will yield further, Dr. Keyworth's letter is to the specific issue of the su-

percomputers and asks that they not be approved.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on the Budget, I wanted to respond to one of the comments made for this amendment, that the budget can be cut by approving this amendment. This is an authorization, not an appropriation. There is plenty of room in the appropriation for the Committee on Appropriations to expend this money if the Committee on Appropriations so chooses.

The budget ceiling is already set. This is not an issue of whether or not we are cutting the budget; it is an issue of what kind of priorities we want to set in the authorization.

That, then, goes to the second point, the issue raised so well by the chairman of the Committee on Science and Technology, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA). What we are talking about here is not authorizing a lot of new computers; we are saying who is to have access to the existing computers.

Under the administration's program, the Government itself has access; DOE has them, Department of Defense has them, NASA's highly specialized aviation needs have access. But the university community overall does not have access. As the NSF's advisory committee has pointed out, biologists, chemists, specialists in atmospheric and oceanographic sciences, engineers of all disciplines, everybody else also ought to have access to supercomputers and that is what this money is for.

The networking that Chairman FUQUA talked about is providing access to universities and scholars all over the country to supercomputers. Should they have access, or should just the Government have access? That is the issue at stake here. I think they should all have access, and to maintain that kind of access, we should turn down the amendment.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIRTH. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, in response to the two points, first, my point on the reallocation of moneys was that last year we did the same thing. We initiated a new program essentially in math, science, elementary school education, which I know the gentleman is a strong supporter of, and the Committee on Appropriations, in funding that program, ended up transferring funds around which impacted on the research directorates, which are the core of the NSF, and they did it as a result

of our creating new authorization levels which I happen to support, but I think it was unfortunate to see research impacted that way.

I think if we do this we run the risk, again, of doing that with really no great return, because I do not think NSF is going to be able to handle the funds.

On the gentleman's second point, NSF is right now doing the networking with the private sector. They are spending several million, actually \$6 million right now, that they have out in grant applications to do exactly what the gentleman requested that they do, which is to bring in the networking RFP's in order to get some private access into Federal computer time.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Chairman, if I may reclaim my time, I appreciate what the gentleman is saying. I think that the priorities that we are arguing for on this side are simply to expand that networking and make sure that it is available to many, many more disciplines than it is now. We believe that is possible and conforms with the priorities set by the NSF Advisory Board. I would defer to what the scientific community has said, and the scientific community has asked that we support this particular amendment.

So I understand the gentleman wanting to cut that down and we just disagree on what those priorities ought to be. If we want to network, let us turn down this amendment.

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIRTH. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALGREN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think the best evidence on what the scientific community recognizes as the proper course in this area would be the Advisory Committee for Advanced Scientific Computing Resources of the National Science Foundation. Their report received March 2, 1984, says, and I quote:

We urge the National Science Foundation to do everything possible to see that funding for the initiative reaches the threshold level to achieve full cooperation from the rest of the community in elevating the total program to full equality with experimental and theoretical science.

Then when one looks in the report for what the threshold level is, it indicates that they cite again the Bardon-Curtis report, citing a level of \$180 million, and state:

We agree that immediate needs are of this order.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIRTH. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FUQUA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I might further point out that Dr. Lewis Branscomb, the chairman of the National Science Board, when asked—

Mr. WIRTH. The chief scientist for IBM.

Mr. FUQUA. The chief scientist for IBM, when asked before the Appropriations Subcommittee, if he felt that \$20 million was adequate, he said it was not adequate; that they did need more money for the very things the gentleman talked about, not to buy computers, even though they may have to purchase some, but really to buy access time, access charges, pay copyright fees, networking costs, so that we can broaden the accessibility of this program to a broader spectrum, rather than just the select few that have access to this.

The Government, as I pointed out, has plenty of access to their programs, but the universities and the people who train the people they need do not have it. We are choking off the source of future scientists.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG), as modified.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. WALKER) there were—ayes 7, noes 9.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 92]

Akaka	Boland	Conable
Albosta	Boner	Conyers
Anderson	Bonior	Cooper
Andrews (NC)	Borski	Corcoran
Andrews (TX)	Boucher	Coughlin
Annunzio	Breaux	Courter
Anthony	Britt	Coyne
Applegate	Brooks	Craig
Archer	Broomfield	Crane, Daniel
AuCoin	Brown (CA)	Crane, Philip
Badham	Brown (CO)	Daniel
Barnard	Broyhill	Dannemeyer
Barnes	Burton (IN)	Darden
Bartlett	Byron	Daub
Bateman	Carney	Davis
Bates	Carper	de la Garza
Bedell	Carr	Dellums
Bellenson	Chandler	Derrick
Bennett	Chappell	DeWine
Berman	Cheney	Dickinson
Bethune	Clarke	Dingell
Biaggi	Clay	Dixon
Billakis	Clinger	Dorgan
Bliley	Coats	Dowdy
Boehlert	Coleman (MO)	Downey
Boggs	Coleman (TX)	Dreier

□ 1720

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana). Three hundred and fifty-three Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present, and the committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER) for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This vote will be reduced to a limit of 5 minutes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 180, not voting 78, as follows:

[Roll No. 93]

AYES—175

Duncan	Lent	Roe
Durbin	Levin	Roemer
Dwyer	Levitas	Rogers
Dyson	Lewis (CA)	Rose
Early	Lewis (FL)	Roukema
Eckart	Livingston	Rowland
Edgar	Lloyd	Rudd
Edwards (CA)	Loeffler	Sabo
Edwards (OK)	Long (LA)	Savage
English	Long (MD)	Schaefer
Erdreich	Lott	Scheuer
Erlenborn	Lowery (CA)	Schneider
Evans (IA)	Lowry (WA)	Schroeder
Evans (IL)	Lujan	Schulze
Fascell	Luken	Schumer
Fazio	Lundine	Seiberling
Feighan	Lungren	Sensenbrenner
Fiedler	Mack	Sharp
Fields	MacKay	Shaw
Fish	Madigan	Shelby
Flippo	Martin (IL)	Shumway
Florio	Martin (NC)	Shuster
Foley	Martin (NY)	Sikorski
Ford (MI)	Martinez	Siljander
Frank	Matsui	Simon
Franklin	Mavroules	Sisisky
Frenzel	Mazzoli	Skeen
Fuqua	McCain	Slattery
Garcia	McCandless	Smith (FL)
Gaydos	McCloskey	Smith (NE)
Gejdenson	McCollum	Smith (NJ)
Gekas	McCurdy	Smith, Denny
Gibbons	McEwen	Smith, Robert
Gilman	McGrath	Snowe
Gingrich	McHugh	Snyder
Glickman	McKernan	Solarz
Gonzalez	McKinney	Solomon
Goodling	Mica	Spence
Gore	Michel	Spratt
Gradison	Mikulski	Staggers
Gramm	Miller (OH)	Stangeland
Gray	Mineta	Stark
Green	Mitchell	Stenholm
Gregg	Moakley	Stratton
Gunderson	Molinari	Studds
Hall (OH)	Mollohan	Stump
Hall, Ralph	Montgomery	Sundquist
Hall, Sam	Moody	Swift
Hamilton	Moore	Synar
Hammerschmidt	Moorhead	Tallon
Hansen (UT)	Morrison (CT)	Tauke
Harkin	Morrison (WA)	Tauzin
Hartnett	Mrazek	Taylor
Hatcher	Murphy	Thomas (CA)
Hawkins	Murtha	Thomas (GA)
Hayes	Myers	Torres
Hefner	Natcher	Torricelli
Hertel	Neal	Towns
Hiller	Nelson	Traxler
Hillis	Nichols	Udall
Holt	Nielson	Vander Jagt
Hopkins	O'Brien	Vandergriff
Horton	Oaker	Vento
Howard	Oberstar	Volkmer
Hoyer	Obey	Walgren
Hubbard	Olin	Walker
Huckaby	Ottlinger	Watkins
Hughes	Owens	Waxman
Hunter	Oxley	Weaver
Hutto	Packard	Weber
Hyde	Panetta	Wheat
Ireland	Parris	Whitehurst
Jeffords	Pashayan	Whitley
Jenkins	Pease	Whittaker
Johnson	Penny	Whitten
Jones (NC)	Pepper	Williams (MT)
Jones (OK)	Perkins	Williams (OH)
Kasich	Petri	Winn
Kastenmeier	Porter	Wirth
Kemp	Price	Wise
Kildee	Pritchard	Wolf
Kindness	Quillen	Wolpe
Kiecicka	Rahall	Wortley
Kolter	Ratchford	Wyden
Kostmayer	Ray	Wyllie
Kramer	Regula	Yates
Lagomarsino	Reid	Yatron
Lantos	Richardson	Young (AK)
Latta	Ridge	Young (FL)
Leach	Rinaldo	Young (MO)
Leath	Ritter	Zschau
Leland	Roberts	

Anderson	Hall, Sam	Petri
Andrews (TX)	Hammerschmidt	Porter
Applegate	Hansen (UT)	Pritchard
Archer	Hartnett	Quillen
AuCoin	Hiler	Ray
Badham	Hillis	Regula
Bartlett	Holt	Ridge
Bateman	Hopkins	Rinaldo
Bates	Hubbard	Ritter
Billhune	Huckaby	Roberts
Billakis	Hughes	Roemer
Bliley	Hunter	Rogers
Broomfield	Hyde	Roukema
Brown (CO)	Johnson	Rudd
Broyhill	Jones (OK)	Schaefer
Burton (IN)	Kasich	Schneider
Byron	Kemp	Schroeder
Carney	Kindness	Schulze
Carper	Kolter	Sensenbrenner
Chandler	Kramer	Shaw
Cheney	Lagomarsino	Shumway
Clinger	Latta	Shuster
Coats	Leach	Siljander
Coleman (MO)	Lent	Sisisky
Conable	Lewis (CA)	Skeen
Cooper	Lewis (FL)	Slattery
Corcoran	Livingston	Smith (NE)
Coughlin	Loeffler	Smith, Denny
Courter	Lott	Smith, Robert
Craig	Lowery (CA)	Snowe
Crane, Daniel	Lujan	Snyder
Crane, Philip	Lungren	Solomon
Daniel	Mack	Spence
Dannemeyer	Madigan	Stangeland
Daub	Martin (IL)	Stenholm
de la Garza	Martin (NC)	Stump
DeWine	Martin (NY)	Sundquist
Dickinson	McCain	Tallion
Dreier	McCandless	Tauke
Duncan	McCollum	Tauzin
Dyson	McEwen	Taylor
Edwards (OK)	McGrath	Thomas (CA)
English	McKernan	Vander Jagt
Erlenborn	Michel	Vandergriff
Evans (IA)	Miller (OH)	Walker
Fiedler	Molinari	Weber
Fields	Montgomery	Whitehurst
Fish	Moore	Whittaker
Franklin	Moorhead	Whitten
Frenzel	Morrison (WA)	Winn
Gaydos	Murphy	Wolf
Gekas	Nielson	Wortley
Gingrich	O'Brien	Wyllie
Goodling	Olin	Yatron
Gradison	Oxley	Young (AK)
Gramm	Packard	Young (FL)
Gregg	Parris	Zschau
Gunderson	Pashayan	
Hall (OH)	Penny	

NOES—180

Akaka	Barnes	Boehert
Albosta	Bedell	Boggs
Andrews (NC)	Beilenson	Boland
Annuzio	Bennett	Boner
Anthony	Berman	Bonior
Barnard	Biaggi	Borski

Boucher	Hefner	Owens
Breaux	Hertel	Panetta
Britt	Horton	Pease
Brooks	Howard	Pepper
Brown (CA)	Hoyer	Perkins
Carr	Hutto	Price
Chappell	Ireland	Rahall
Clarke	Jeffords	Ratchford
Clay	Jenkins	Reid
Coleman (TX)	Jones (NC)	Richardson
Conyers	Kastenmeier	Roe
Coyne	Kildee	Rose
Crockett	Kiecicka	Rowland
Darden	Kostmayer	Sabo
Davis	Lantos	Savage
Dellums	Leath	Scheuer
Derrick	Lehman (FL)	Schumer
Dingell	Leland	Seiberling
Dixon	Levin	Sharp
Dorgan	Levitas	Shelby
Dowdy	Lloyd	Sikorski
Downey	Long (LA)	Simon
Durbin	Long (MD)	Smith (FL)
Dwyer	Lowry (WA)	Smith (NJ)
Early	Luken	Solarz
Eckart	Lundine	Spratt
Edgar	MacKay	Staggers
Edwards (CA)	Martinez	Stark
Erdreich	Matsui	Stratton
Evans (IL)	Mavroules	Studds
Fascell	Mazzoli	Swift
Fazio	McCloskey	Synar
Feighan	McCurdy	Thomas (GA)
Flippo	McHugh	Torres
Florio	McKinney	Torricelli
Foley	Mica	Towns
Ford (MI)	Mikulski	Traxler
Frank	Mineta	Udall
Fuqua	Mitchell	Vento
Garcia	Moakley	Volkmer
Gejdenson	Mollohan	Walgren
Gibbons	Moody	Watkins
Gilman	Morrison (CT)	Waxman
Glickman	Mrazek	Weaver
Gonzalez	Murtha	Wheat
Gore	Myers	Whitley
Gray	Natcher	Williams (MT)
Green	Neal	Williams (OH)
Hall, Ralph	Nelson	Wirth
Hamilton	Nichols	Wise
Harkin	Oakar	Wolpe
Hatcher	Oberstar	Wyden
Hawkins	Obey	Yates
Hayes	Ottlinger	Young (MO)

NOT VOTING—78

Ackerman	Fowler	Minish
Addabbo	Frost	Nowak
Alexander	Gephardt	Ortiz
Aspin	Guarini	Patman
Bereuter	Hall (IN)	Patterson
Bevill	Hance	Paul
Bonker	Hansen (ID)	Pickle
Bosco	Harrison	Pursell
Boxer	Heftel	Rangel
Bryant	Hightower	Robinson
Burton (CA)	Jacobs	Rodino
Campbell	Jones (TN)	Rostenkowski
Chapple	Kaptur	Roth
Coelho	Kazen	Roybal
Collins	Kennelly	Russo
Conte	Kogovsek	Sawyer
D'Amours	LaFalce	Shannon
Daschle	Lehman (CA)	Skelton
Dicks	Levine	Smith (IA)
Donnelly	Lipinski	St Germain
Dymally	Markey	Stokes
Edwards (AL)	Marlenee	Valentine
Emerson	Marriott	Vucanovich
Ferraro	McDade	Weiss
Foglietta	McNulty	Wilson
Ford (TN)	Miller (CA)	Wright

□ 1730

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Emerson for, with Mr. Addabbo against.

Mr. Edwards of Alabama for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Marriott for, with Mr. Guarini against.

Mr. Paul for, with Mrs. Collins against.
Mr. Chapple for, with Mr. Levine of California against.

Mr. Robinson for, with Mr. Lehman of California against.

Messrs. BIAGGI and SIKORSKI changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

So the amendments, as modified, were rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOEHLERT

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOEHLERT: On page 3, after line 3, insert the following new subsection:

(d) In the obligation, use, and expenditure of the amounts authorized under subsection (a)(3) for Biotic Systems and Resources and the amounts authorized under subsection (a)(4) for Atmospheric Sciences, emphasis shall be placed on basic scientific research to support a better understanding of the environmental processes that contribute to acid rain.

Mr. BOEHLERT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is simple. It would insure that we are attacking acid rain with the sense of urgency the problem demands.

Each new study on acid rain brings forth alarming new evidence about the extent and severity of the acid rain problem. We cannot afford to just sit back and ignore this growing threat to our lakes, farms, and forests.

That point was brought home more forcefully than ever in a report just issued by the National Wildlife Federation—the largest and most conservative environmental group in the country.

The report opens with the bold declaration that "acid rain is not just New England's problem any more." The report then goes on to document the presence of, and damage done by acid rain in 21 States, covering every region of the country.

Indeed, if Woody Guthrie were alive today, he could easily rewrite "This Land Is Your Land" into a protest song about acid rain. We have the hard facts to prove that "from California to the New York Island, from the Redwood Forest to the Gulf Stream waters," this land is being destroyed by acid rain.

Let me just cite a few of the stark statistics compiled by the Wildlife Federation.

In my home State of New York, the average rainfall is 25 times more acidic than unpolluted rain. And rainfall has

been measured that is as much as 40 times more acidic as unpolluted rain. The resulting level of sulfates deposited in Adirondack lakes is twice the level needed to begin destroying aquatic life.

It is no wonder, then, that almost 200 lakes in the Adirondack Mountains are now devoid of life. An additional 256 lakes in this once-pristine region are in need of hospice care.

But the effects of acid rain are hardly limited to fish. The federation report is just the most recent of several studies to point to acid rain as a cause of the dramatic deterioration of forests all up and down the eastern seaboard. Thanks to acid rain, we are potentially facing what one leading scientist has called the ecological catastrophe of the century.

Acid rain also hits closer to home. Drinking water supplies have been polluted by toxic wastes that acid rain leaches out of the soil and plumbing. A reservoir just north of my district has become so acidified that lead concentrations in drinking water exceed the maximum limit for human consumption.

All told, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation has estimated that acid rain could be costing New York and New England as much as \$2.5 billion a year in agricultural, industrial, and other losses.

But what is most significant, as I stated at the outset, is that New York's sad situation is far from unique.

I urge each of you to look up the details on your own State in the federation report. You will quickly see why acid rain has been called chemical leprosy and a sewer in the sky. I am afraid that for many the information in the report will be a rude awakening.

But such an awakening is much indeed. The report should be a sounding of reveille. It should wake us up to the responsibility of dealing with this major problem.

Now, I have long been an advocate of immediate action to stop acid rain. As a cosponsor of H.R. 3400, the Waxman-Sikorski bill, and of H.R. 4404, the New England Caucus' acid rain bill, I have argued vehemently that we know what causes acid rain, and that we know how to eliminate it at a reasonable cost. I believe more strongly than ever that the time to mandate a cut in sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide emissions is right now.

I have pressed that point in speeches, at congressional hearings, in letters to the President, and in a private meeting with William Ruckelshaus, the head of the EPA.

But calls by me and other Members for prompt action have been drowned out by a Greek chorus chanting "More research, more research."

There is no question that more research is needed. But many of us fear

that, as one pundit has put it, "If we just do more research, we're going to end up with the best documented environmental disaster in history."

However, conducting research is certainly preferable to doing nothing at all. Unfortunately, more often than not, congressional calls for more research have simply been a way to put off more decisive action.

The amendment I am proposing would give us a chance to put our votes where our mouths are. The amendment would not require us to spend more money, but it would put us on record as mandating the most comprehensive, the most rigorous, the most effective acid rain research program possible. If we are serious about learning more about acid rain, we have to require that our national research effort focus on the problem.

We have recently seen just how effective a concentrated national research effort can be. When the Government decided that AIDS was our No. 1 health threat, it made AIDS research a priority. As a result, in a remarkably brief period of time, scientists believe they have discovered the cause of the syndrome.

Well, the President declared last year that acid rain was our No. 1 environmental priority—as it should be. Acid rain's effect on the environment is just as wide ranging and debilitating as the effect of AIDS on the human body. Both break down the natural systems vital to life. But with acid rain, all of us are in a high-risk group.

The only way we are going to learn enough about acid rain to create a consensus for action is by making acid rain the primary focus of our national research effort. This amendment would simply make that priority clear to the National Science Foundation.

For too long, our response to acid rain has been hand wringing. Now it is time to do some alarm ringing instead. We have got to commit our financial resources to dealing with acid rain if we are going to preserve our natural resources.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOEHLERT. I yield to the distinguished committee chairman.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, we had a chance on this side to review the gentleman's amendment. We think it contributes to the bill and addresses a very important issue that we feel must have additional emphasis. We are willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. BOEHLERT. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOEHLERT. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman for his amendment. As someone who has been very active in the acid rain battle and who supports stronger emphasis, I join with the gentleman from New York in his battle because it so grievously harms his district and I strongly support the proposal and the amendment.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: On page 3, following line 3, add the following new subsection:

"(d) Of the sums authorized pursuant to this section, each sum is hereby reduced by 3.9 percent."

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is strictly a 3.9-percent across-the-board reduction in the funding of the NSF programs.

What it does is it attempts to bring the program funding into line with the President's original request which was a 13.6-percent increase over last year's funding. This particular measure would not gut any program in NSF. As a matter of fact, it still allows an adequate funding for everything from engineering through the women and minorities programs to science education.

□ 1740

In other words, adopt this amendment and you are still adopting a 13.5-percent increase in the NSF budget. The House has already agreed to hold NASA to a very modest growth level. It seems to me that the National Science Foundation could also be held to a modest 13.6-percent increase in its funding.

When this bill came out of the committee, it did not come out unanimously. This bill came out of committee on a 24-to-14 vote. It seems to me if we want to exercise some fiscal discipline, if we want to stay true to what we claim in terms of deficits that we ought to be doing something about ending those deficits.

Let me suggest that if we cannot keep the funding of NSF under control, we cannot keep anything under control.

There are many programs within the National Science Foundation that are very worthwhile programs. I am going to talk about a few programs here for a moment that may be very worthwhile, but the question that this House had better answer now and you had better be able to answer out on the campaign trail this fall is whether or not these kinds of programs are the

kinds of things we ought to be spending money on as add-on to the Federal deficit, because that is what we are talking about here; add-on to the Federal deficit.

The latest list of programs under the National Science Foundation that they have spent money for, taxpayers money for, includes such meritorious items as: The social ecology of the free-ranging coyotes.

Now, I would suggest that \$6,000 of taxpayers money going to study the social ecology of free-ranging coyotes might be something that your constituents would have a little bit of trouble understanding why you voted for \$58 million more to do that.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WEBER. I thank the gentleman.

How much money did the gentleman say was spent on that particular study?

Mr. WALKER. My information here was—I am sorry, I said \$6,000 and that is wrong. It is actually three times that amount. It was \$18,742 that was spent.

Mr. WEBER. Would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WALKER. Glad to.

Mr. WEBER. I am glad the gentleman cleared that up. I would not want to see us financing an inadequate study of the social ecology of free-ranging coyotes, and I am glad to know it was \$18,000 rather than a mere \$6,000.

But I have a question. Does the gentleman know whether this was a comparative study? Was there also a study done on the social ecology of house-bound coyotes?

Mr. WALKER. I do not think that study has been done yet. But it may be in this year's budget. They appropriate \$58 million more.

Mr. WEBER. I see. I thank the gentleman. I am anxious to hear more on his list.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman would be interested to know that another meritorious project that we spent money on was the function and ontogeny of the leech nervous system. We not only spent money on that, \$60,000 at one university, but we had two universities looking into that particular matter, the leech nervous system at \$60,000 each; that is \$120,000. The leeches are important to us, but I do not know that they are that important.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to have this cleared up if we can. Are these programs that are in the authorization

measure that are before us now or are they programs that were in a previous authorization?

Mr. WALKER. The latest information that we have is 1982 and these are programs that NSF has seen fit to fund within the last couple of years.

This is the most current information we have. Some of these programs are ongoing.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. This is the most current information, so we have every reason to believe that the continuation of these studies may very well be in this bill.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman is correct. And the thing is this is a pattern. I mean, I am reading from some current things. If you go back a couple of years, we find out they have sent money on things like an assessment of the social consequences of the adoption and use of citizen band radios in the United States. Now there is a dandy. That cost us \$136,000.

We produced three films with this money; three films on the behavior of the ring dove; that cost us \$193,000. We made a study on the crowding and its effect on humans. Maybe we ought to take a look at that study in this House. That cost us \$52,000.

And we continue to spend. This is part of a pattern, this is what the taxpayers' money is being used for.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. Glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I thank the gentleman.

I just have to ask the question: Do you think that study on "An Empirical Approach to Automobile Industry Issues" is in this bill?

Mr. WALKER. It very well could be. We have already spent \$60,000 for it, but we may well be wanting to spend a lot more. We are going over the budget here.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER) has expired.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. DANNEMEYER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I think, Members, that it is appropriate for us to understand some of the provisions that are in this piece of legislation. And if you want to go home and explain to your constituents at a

time when we are facing \$180 billion deficit or more that this House is continuing the authorization for boondoggles that are described by this nomenclature, go right ahead.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FUQUA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman explain to me his determination of "boondoggle?" I was looking back at some program called the "Viruses in Monkey Cells." Do you know what? Some guy, I do not know whether he deserved it or not, won a Nobel Prize for that; because it helped develop polio vaccine by Dr. Salk.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. You know, I will reclaim my time.

Here's one, physical education in 19th century British universities: The Scottish universities. Now, I ask my colleagues, do you think it is realistic in that esoteric pursuit we are likely to discover yet another vaccine to alleviate human suffering? I do not think it is reasonable to expect.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I will be happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. WEBER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The point I would like to make to the distinguished chairman of the committee is this body has just voted down a very reasonable, targeted amendment by the gentleman from New Hampshire which would have succeeded in imposing some reasonable restraint on the budgets of the National Science Foundation without endangering other programs and repeatedly this body continues to vote down those kinds of amendments.

What the gentleman in the well, I think, is trying to illustrate is that if we cannot find some place to cut the NSF budget, then indeed, we ought to just pack up and go home, because we cannot cut anything.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, because I started off by mentioning some of these may be worthwhile. I do not know. From the titles of them, you would have to question it. But I would suggest another study we are spending \$55,000 for that is entitled the "Vocal Variables and the Nature of the Interviewer Respondent Interaction in Telephone Surveys" is something that our constituents would just as soon be without. They are tired of telephone surveys anyhow.

To spend \$55,000 of their money to study them is something we can cut out and I do not think we are going to stop anybody from developing a polio

vaccine by cutting out that kind of money.

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I would be happy to yield to my colleague (Mr. PEASE).

Mr. PEASE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I used to serve on the Science Committee; I no longer do. I think it is very appropriate for questions to be raised on the floor about whether we are exceeding the budget resolution, whether we are authorizing more than the President recommended and so on.

But I hope that we would not reduce the level of the debate to the level of ridiculing scientific research. If there is anything we need in our country today, it is scientific research. We are engaged in a battle with the Japanese and others, and I hope we will not go through this know-nothingism that I see on this floor today.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I will reclaim my time from the gentleman.

No one, I will respond to my colleague, nobody in this Chamber objects to the legitimate pursuit of science for science's sake and what it may bring to our attention in years to come.

But now I ask you, the adaptive strategies of Georgia farmers. What is that; a rehash of the Carter campaign? What possible good could come from that?

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. WALGREN. Is there an implication in what the gentleman raises that this money that we are authorizing in this bill would fund that study? I would think not. The truth of the matter is that these titles that are being raised are being raised from times past; not times future.

□ 1750

The National Science Foundation and the Director thereof, which is an appointment of President Reagan, has absolute control over what the specific funding is that will be given to these projects.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I am reclaiming my time and yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER).

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania is correct that these are past studies. What we have here though is a whole series of years and years and years of this type of performance out of NSF.

What I am suggesting is that if the Members want to bust the budget—and that is what you are doing you are busting the budget to \$58 million and you have been busting the budget on NSF for years and years and years—

what you are getting for all the additional money you are spending are programs that are very, very hard to justify to the taxpayers out there.

This is a taxpayer argument. You can make all the intellectual arguments you want to make, but the question is whether the taxpayers of this country deserve better than they have been getting out of this money. I think they deserve far better than some of the programs that we have had come out of NSF over a period of years.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, so many times we get into arguments here about that if we try to reduce the level of authorization for some particular agency that we are against that particular agency. I happen to be a supporter of the National Science Foundation. They do a lot of good research work, but that does not mean that we give them an unlimited amount of money.

I think that the amendment is good and it is proper to bring it back to the level that the National Science Foundation asked for. The committee went ahead and put more money in because they wanted to do so. But, as a matter of fact, the amount is what NSF has asked for.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that our debate does not degenerate into one of fancy titles and so forth that some researcher may have dreamed up because you can generally get a pretty good belly laugh when you read some of them until you better understand what the results were.

I live in Florida. It is a very humid area. I remember as a kid the devastating effect of the screwworm fly. And somebody had the audacity to apply to somebody for a study of the sex life of the screwworm. Now that total menace has been eliminated from all of those Southern States where it was such a terrible thing.

Somebody starting talking about the skin grafts in rabbits. Now I am sure people go around and want to do a lot of skin grafts in rabbits, but the Nobel Prize was awarded for immune responses and opened the door to organ transplants because of some work that was done on skin grafts in rabbits.

There was another one about the excretion of urine in a dog. Now that is a subject that I hope we do not degenerate into that type of talk, but Dr. James Shannon, a former Director of NIH, later won one of the highest awards in this country, the National Medal of Service, for his research in

this area. It led to the function of understanding human kidneys in relation to hormones and kidney functions.

So I think we had better be extremely careful, Mr. Chairman, as we come out with some of these so-called ridiculous sounding names.

Sometime go to a college graduation and look at the titles of some of the research papers, yet, we have produced some very outstanding scientists.

Let us get back to the subject of the amendment. The amendment cuts across the board almost 4 percent. Many of the requests that the administration has made that they feel are very important are such as in the field of mathematical and physical sciences and engineering, even in our Antarctic program. Many of the others are cut across the board by this amendment. And I would hope that the Members of this body and the committee would act in the same prudent fashion they did on the previous amendment and reject this amendment overwhelmingly.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I would simply like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee a question. I agree that scientific research is important. My question would simply be that in light of some of the expenditures that have been enumerated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, could the chairman tell us, for example, what in regard to physics education in 19th century British universities; The Scottish universities, what relation does that have to scientific research?

I think there are some questionable items in the list that has been offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FUQUA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Well, there is a category in the National Science Foundation relating to biological, behavioral, and social sciences, trying to understand behaviors of certain things from a scientific basis. I am not familiar with the study. I am not standing here to defend it or condone it. But I might say that we will be happy to try to find the purposes of the research and where it came from for any Member of Congress. They are entitled to that. They have access to the National Science Foundation. Dr. Knapp, who is a very fine scientist, was appointed by this President, approved by the Senate, and I think he does a very good job in prudently spending the taxpayers' money.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think it is possible to explain a study in 19th century Scotland on the question of physics in terms of what cultural tendencies are present when certain discoveries are made at certain times. I think it is entirely possible to explain that kind of research as reasonable and appropriate.

I want to support the chairman's comment about the screwworm. It seems to me that a few years ago if a proposal had been offered to study the sex life of the fruit fly, for example, either the Oriental or the Mexican fruit fly, that we could have ridiculed that as well.

But clearly it has provided us with the primary nonpesticide control of these flies through the sex cycle understanding and the use of Malathion.

I think the point I would like to make, however, is that I believe the rejection of reasonable amendments, as I believe the Gregg amendment to have been, only promotes the kind of action that we have here where we get into the ridiculous examination of various projects.

And what I would ask the Members to do is examine reasoned offerings to limit the amounts of money, to provide for necessary research, but rational reasonable limitations. I believe that was rejected.

Therefore, I think the fault lies on both sides of the aisle in terms of the degeneration of this discussion.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WEBER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make the point to my colleague from California, who just spoke, that his point is absolutely well taken, were it not for the fact that the committee has proven now, 4 years running, that it is incapable of doing precisely what the gentleman from California just suggested. Republican members of the committee have suggested reasonable amendments to reduce funding in all those years and they have been rejected.

So we are forced to take this approach.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, because I think it is important to understand that a few minutes ago I rose in strong support of the Gregg amendment and said that it was a targeted approach that should be accepted by the House because that

was the way in which to reduce this particular budget.

I also suggested at that time that if we could not take that targeted approach that you can take an across-the-board approach. When you take an across-the-board approach it seems to me it is entirely reasonable then to take a look at how we are spending the money within that agency at the present time.

Some of the ways in which we are spending money in that agency at the present time cannot be justified on this House floor. The Members know it and they are very sensitive to the fact that these points get raised.

I would prefer not to raise these points. For 3 years running I have not raised these points on the House floor for that reason.

But I think that it is high time that we recognize that every time we vote to bust the budget around here, we are busting the budget to spend taxpayers' dollars on wholly irresponsible kinds of things out in the countryside. It is high time that that irresponsible spending be brought under control. This would be a good start to cut this budget by 3.9 percent.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER.)

The question was taken, and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 170, noes 183, not voting 80, as follows:

[Roll No. 94]

AYES—170

Andrews (NC)	Daub	Holt
Applegate	Davis	Hopkins
Archer	DeWine	Hubbard
Badham	Dickinson	Hughes
Bartlett	Dreier	Hunter
Bateman	Duncan	Hyde
Bethune	English	Johnson
Billirakis	Erdreich	Kasich
Billiey	Erlenborn	Kemp
Breaux	Evans (IA)	Kindness
Britt	Fiedler	Kolter
Broomfield	Fields	Kostmayer
Brown (CO)	Fish	Kramer
Broyhill	Franklin	Lagomarsino
Burton (IN)	Frenzel	Latta
Byron	Gaydos	Lent
Carney	Gekas	Livingston
Carper	Gingrich	Loeffler
Chandler	Goodling	Lott
Cheney	Gradison	Lowery (CA)
Clinger	Gramm	Lujan
Coats	Gregg	Luken
Coleman (MO)	Gunderson	Lungren
Conable	Hall (OH)	Mack
Corcoran	Hall, Sam	Martin (IL)
Coughlin	Hamilton	Martin (NC)
Courter	Hammerschmidt	Martin (NY)
Craig	Hansen (UT)	McCain
Crane, Daniel	Hartnett	McCandless
Crane, Philip	Hefner	McCollum
Daniel	Hiler	McEwen
Dannemeyer	Hillis	McGrath

Michel	Roberts	Stump
Miller (OH)	Roemer	Sundquist
Molinari	Rogers	Tallon
Montgomery	Roukema	Tauke
Moore	Rudd	Tauzin
Moorhead	Schaefer	Taylor
Morrison (WA)	Schulze	Thomas (CA)
Murphy	Sensenbrenner	Vander Jagt
Myers	Sharp	Vandergriff
Neal	Shaw	Walker
Nielson	Shumway	Watkins
O'Brien	Shuster	Weber
Oxley	Sikorski	Whitehurst
Packard	Siljander	Whitley
Parris	Sisisky	Whittaker
Pashayan	Skeen	Williams (OH)
Penny	Slattery	Winn
Petri	Smith (NE)	Wolf
Porter	Smith (NJ)	Wortley
Pritchard	Smith, Denny	Wylie
Quillen	Smith, Robert	Yatron
Ray	Snyder	Young (AK)
Regula	Solomon	Young (FL)
Rinaldo	Spence	Zschau
Ritter	Stenholm	

NOES—183

Akaka	Gibbons	Natcher
Albosta	Gilman	Nelson
Anderson	Glickman	Nichols
Andrews (TX)	Gonzalez	Oakar
Annunzio	Gore	Oberstar
Anthony	Gray	Obeys
AuCoin	Green	Olin
Barnard	Hall, Ralph	Ottinger
Barnes	Harkin	Owens
Bates	Hatcher	Panetta
Bedell	Hawkins	Pease
Beilenson	Hayes	Pepper
Bennett	Hertel	Perkins
Berman	Horton	Price
Biaggi	Howard	Rahall
Boehlert	Hoyer	Ratchford
Boggs	Huckaby	Reid
Boland	Hutto	Richardson
Boner	Ireland	Ridge
Bonior	Jeffords	Roe
Borski	Jenkins	Rose
Boucher	Jones (NC)	Rowland
Brooks	Jones (OK)	Sabo
Brown (CA)	Kastenmeier	Savage
Carr	Kildee	Scheuer
Chappell	Kleczka	Schneider
Clarke	Lantos	Schroeder
Clay	Leach	Schumer
Coleman (TX)	Leath	Selberling
Conyers	Lehman (FL)	Shelby
Cooper	Leland	Simon
Coyne	Levin	Smith (FL)
Crockett	Levitass	Snowe
Darden	Lewis (CA)	Solarz
de la Garza	Lewis (FL)	Spratt
Dellums	Lloyd	Staggers
Derrick	Long (LA)	Stark
Dingell	Long (MD)	Stratton
Dixon	Lowry (WA)	Studds
Dorgan	Lundine	Swift
Dowdy	MacKay	Synar
Downey	Madigan	Thomas (GA)
Durbin	Martinez	Torres
Dwyer	Matsui	Torricelli
Dyson	Mavroules	Towns
Early	Mazzoli	Traxler
Eckart	McCloskey	Udall
Edgar	McCurdy	Vento
Edwards (CA)	McHugh	Volkmer
Evans (IL)	McKernan	Walgren
Fascell	McKinney	Waxman
Fazio	Mica	Weaver
Feighan	Mikulski	Wheat
Filippo	Mineta	Whitten
Florio	Mitchell	Williams (MT)
Foley	Moakley	Wirth
Ford (MI)	Mollohan	Wise
Frank	Moody	Wolpe
Fuqua	Morrison (CT)	Wyden
Garcia	Mrazek	Yates
Gejdenson	Murtha	Young (MO)

NOT VOTING—80

Ackerman	Bevill	Burton (CA)
Addabbo	Bonker	Campbell
Alexander	Bosco	Chappie
Aspin	Boxer	Coelho
Bereuter	Bryant	Collins

Conte	Jacobs	Pickle
D'Amours	Jones (TN)	Pursell
Daschle	Kaptur	Rangel
Dicks	Kazen	Robinson
Donnelly	Kennelly	Rodino
Dymally	Kogovsek	Rostenkowski
Edwards (AL)	LaFalce	Roth
Edwards (OK)	Lehman (CA)	Roybal
Emerson	Levine	Russo
Ferraro	Lipinski	Sawyer
Foglietta	Markey	Shannon
Ford (TN)	Marlenee	Skelton
Fowler	Marriott	Smith (IA)
Frost	McDade	St Germain
Gephardt	McNulty	Stangeland
Guarini	Miller (CA)	Stokes
Hall (IN)	Minish	Valentine
Hance	Nowak	Vucanovich
Hansen (ID)	Ortiz	Weiss
Harrison	Patman	Wilson
Hefelt	Patterson	Wright
Hightower	Paul	

□ 1810

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Emerson for, with Mr. Addabbo, against.

Mr. Paul for, with Mr. Guarini against.

Mrs. Vucanovich for, with Mr. Lehman of California against.

Mr. Marriott for, with Ms. Kaptur against.

Mr. Chappie for, with Mrs. Collins against.

Ms. MIKULSKI changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. KOLTER and Mrs. JOHNSON changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, according to your committee report, you strongly recommend that the National Science Foundation support and use television for science and math education. I believe that this is an extremely important and timely issue for strong Federal support particularly given that recent reports on education indicate that our country is falling behind in these areas. In fact, a recent National Science Board report calls television "the most pervasive medium of informal education," and recommends increased Federal support for science and math programming for children.

Mr. Chairman, public television has had several important successes in the area of science education. Programs such as "3-2-1 Contact," "Nova," "Discover: The World of Science," "Innovation," "Science in Action," and others have played a critical role in educating our children. Yet, while NSF has supported some of these programs, funding for these important shows has often been very limited.

Public television witnesses have testified before Congress that increased funds are needed to continue to produce new shows, such as 20 new episodes for "3-2-1 Contact," and to develop and produce a new companion math series for children. These two ac-

tivities alone will cost about \$10 million during the next fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, does this authorization bill include sufficient funds to expand NSF's role in funding science and math programs for children?

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIRTH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALGREN. As the committee report on H.R. 4974 makes clear, we strongly urge that NSF expand its commitment to math and science programming for children. Programs such as "3-2-1 Contact" have achieved remarkable results in science education in the home and in the classroom. They are an extremely cost-effective way to enhance the education of children.

In addition, WQED, our public television station in Pittsburgh has developed Project Prism to produce more science programming, and involve the entire community—teachers, parents, businesses, and other institutions—in science education. This is an extremely innovative and worthwhile proposal which could greatly enhance the public's understanding of science.

NSF has made an important contribution to some of these efforts, but I agree that a much greater proportion of funding should go toward public television for science and math education.

Mr. WIRTH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would also like to ask Mr. GREGG for his thoughts on NSF's role in supporting this math and science programming for children.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I agree with Mr. WIRTH, and with you, Mr. Chairman, that NSF should expand its role in supporting public broadcasting. Given that the average child spends some 10,000 to 15,000 hours in front of the television set before he or she graduates from high school, the quality of the programming offered is critical. As our committee report outlines, I strongly concur that NSF should offer increasing support for television programming for science and math education. Further, support for innovative technologies, such as computers and interactive video discs should be encouraged.

Mr. WIRTH. I thank my colleagues, and compliment you on this legislation. I look forward to working with both of you to increase the funding for public television for science and math programs for children.

□ 1820

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there further amendments to section 2? If not, the Clerk will designate section 3.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remain-

der of the bill be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The remaining text of H.R. 4974 is as follows:

SEC. 3. Appropriations made under authorizations provided in sections 2 and 5 shall remain available for obligation or obligation and expenditure for periods specified in the Acts making the appropriations.

SEC. 4. From appropriations made under authorizations provided in this Act, not more than \$3,500 may be used for official consultation, representation, or other extraordinary expenses at the discretion of the Director of the National Science Foundation. His determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

SEC. 5. In addition to the sums authorized by section 2, not more than \$2,800,000 is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1985 for expenses of the National Science Foundation incurred outside the United States, to be drawn from foreign currencies that the Treasury Department determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States.

SEC. 6. If the total amount of appropriations made by any Act for the fiscal year 1985 for program activities included in sections 2 and 5 is less than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for those activities by sections 2 and 5, the amount available from such appropriations for any particular program activity shall bear the same ratio to the amount authorized to be appropriated for that activity by sections 2 and 5 as the total amount of the appropriations made by such appropriation Act for all included program activities bears to the total amount authorized to be appropriated for those activities by sections 2 and 5 (with the minimum amounts required by section 2(b) being reduced in the same ratio), except to the extent specifically otherwise provided in the text of the Act making the appropriations for the program activities involved.

SEC. 7. (a) Funds may be transferred among the categories listed in section 2(a) so long as the net funds transferred to or from any category do not exceed 10 per centum of the amount authorized for that category in section 2.

(b) In addition, the Director of the Foundation may propose transfers to or from any category exceeding 10 per centum of the amounts authorized for that category in section 2; but an explanation of any such proposed transfer must be transmitted in writing to the Speaker of the House, the President of the Senate, and the appropriate authorizing committees of the House and Senate, and the proposed transfer may be made only when—

(1) thirty calendar days have passed after the transmission of such written explanation, or

(2) the chairman of each of the appropriate authorizing committees of the House and Senate has notified the Director in writing that such committee has no objection to the proposed transfer.

SEC. 8. (a) The last sentence of section 4(e) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended by striking out "by registered mail or certified mail mailed to his last known address of record".

(b) The text of section 9 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 9. (a) Each special commission established under section 4(h) shall be appointed by the Board, and shall consist of such members as the Board considers appropriate.

(b) Special commissions may be established to study and make recommendations to the Foundation on issues relating to research and education in science and engineering."

(c) Section 12 of such Act is amended by striking out subsection (b), and by striking out "(a)" after "Sec. 12."

(d) Section 14 of such Act is amended by striking out subsection (b).

(e) Section 6 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1978 (Public Law 95-99), is repealed.

(f) Section 10 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1978 (Public Law 95-99), is repealed.

SEC. 9. (a) Section 3(a)(1) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended—

(1) by striking out "engineering,"; and

(2) by inserting after "other sciences," the following: "and to initiate and support research fundamental to the engineering process and programs to strengthen engineering research potential and engineering education programs at all levels in the various fields of engineering."

(b)(1)(A) Section 3(a)(3) of such Act is amended—

(i) by inserting "and engineering" after "scientific"; and

(ii) by inserting "and engineers" after "scientists".

(B) Section 3(a)(4) of such Act is amended by inserting "and engineering" after "sciences".

(C) Section 3(a)(5) of such Act is amended by inserting "and fields of engineering" after "sciences".

(D) Section 3(a)(6) of such Act is amended by striking out "technical" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "engineering".

(E) Section 3(a)(7) of such Act is amended by inserting "and engineering" after "scientific".

(2) Section 3(b) of such Act is amended by inserting "and engineering" after "scientific" each place it appears.

(3) Section 3(c) of such Act is amended—

(A) by inserting "and engineering" after "scientific" in the first sentence; and

(B) by inserting "and engineering research" after "applied scientific research" in the second sentence.

(4) Section 3(d) of such Act is amended by striking out "basic research and education in the sciences" and inserting in lieu thereof "research and education in science and engineering".

(5) Section 3(e) of such Act is amended by inserting "and engineering" after "sciences".

(6) Section 4(c) of such Act is amended—

(A) by inserting "and engineering" after "scientific" in clause (3) of the first sentence;

(B) by inserting "and engineering" after "scientific" in the second sentence; and

(C) by inserting "the National Academy of Engineering," after "National Academy of Sciences," and "engineering," after "scientific", in the third sentence.

(7) The first sentence of section 10 of such Act is amended by striking out "scientific study or scientific work in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineer-

ing, social, and other sciences" and inserting in lieu thereof "study and research in the sciences or in engineering".

(8) Section 11 of such Act is amended—

(A) by inserting "or engineering" after "scientific" each place it appears in subsections (c) and (i); and

(B) by inserting "engineering," after "scientific" where it first appears in subsection (g).

(9) Section 12 of such Act is amended by inserting "or engineering" after "scientific".

(10) Section 13 of such Act is amended—

(A) by inserting "or engineering" after "scientific" each place it appears; and

(B) by inserting "or engineers" after "scientists" in subsection (a).

(11) Section 14 of such Act is amended—

(A) by inserting "or engineering" after "scientific" each place it appears in subsection (f); and

(B) by striking out "technical" in subsection (g) and inserting in lieu thereof "engineering".

(12) Section 15(b) of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "technical" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "engineering"; and

(B) by inserting "or engineering" after "scientific" in paragraph (2).

(13) Section 2(b) of Public Law 94-86 is amended by inserting "or engineering" after "science" each place it appears.

(c) The amendments made by this section shall be effective on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there further amendments to the bill?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA) having assumed the chair, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4974) to authorize appropriations to the National Science Foundation for fiscal years 1985 and 1986 pursuant to House Resolution 480, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill. The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 252, noes 99, not voting 82, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

AYES—252

Akaka	Garcia	Moody
Albosta	Gaydos	Moore
Anderson	Gejdenson	Morrison (CT)
Andrews (NC)	Gibbons	Mrazek
Andrews (TX)	Gilman	Murphy
Anunzio	Gingrich	Murtha
Anthony	Glickman	Myers
Applegate	Gonzalez	Natcher
AuCoin	Gore	Neal
Barnard	Gradison	Nelson
Barnes	Gray	Nichols
Bateman	Green	O'Brien
Bates	Hall (OH)	Oakar
Bedell	Hall, Ralph	Oberstar
Bellenson	Hamilton	Obey
Bennett	Harkin	Olin
Berman	Hatcher	Ottenger
Biaggi	Hawkins	Owens
Boehlert	Hayes	Panetta
Boggs	Hefner	Pease
Boland	Hertel	Penny
Boner	Hillis	Pepper
Bonior	Holt	Perkins
Borski	Horton	Porter
Boucher	Howard	Price
Breaux	Hoyer	Pritchard
Britt	Huckaby	Quillen
Brooks	Hughes	Rahall
Brown (CA)	Hutto	Ratchford
Byron	Ireland	Ray
Carney	Jeffords	Regula
Carper	Jenkins	Reid
Carr	Johnson	Richardson
Chandler	Jones (OK)	Ridge
Chappell	Kastenmeier	Rinaldo
Clay	Kildee	Roe
Clinger	Kleczka	Rose
Coleman (MO)	Kolter	Rowland
Coleman (TX)	Kostmayer	Sabo
Conyers	Lantos	Savage
Cooper	Leach	Scheuer
Coughlin	Leath	Schroeder
Coyne	Lehman (FL)	Schulze
Crockett	Leland	Schumer
Darden	Lent	Seiberling
Davis	Levin	Sharp
de la Garza	Levitas	Shaw
Dellums	Lloyd	Shelby
Derrick	Long (LA)	Sikorski
Dingell	Long (MD)	Simon
Dixon	Lowery (CA)	Sisisky
Dorgan	Lowry (WA)	Skeen
Dowdy	Lujan	Smith (FL)
Downey	Luken	Smith (NJ)
Duncan	Lundine	Smith, Robert
Durbin	MacKay	Snowe
Dwyer	Madigan	Solarz
Dyson	Martin (NC)	Spratt
Early	Martin (NY)	Staggers
Eckart	Martinez	Stratton
Edgar	Matsui	Studds
Edwards (CA)	Mavroules	Swift
English	Mazzoli	Synar
Erdreich	McCloskey	Tallon
Erlenborn	McCurdy	Tauke
Evans (IA)	McGrath	Tauzin
Evans (IL)	McHugh	Thomas (GA)
Fascell	McKernan	Torres
Fazio	McKinney	Torricelli
Feighan	Mica	Towns
Fish	Mikulski	Udall
Flippo	Mineta	Vander Jagt
Florio	Mitchell	Vandergriff
Foley	Moakley	Vento
Ford (MI)	Molinaro	Volkmer
Frank	Mollohan	Walgren
Fuqua	Montgomery	Watkins

Waxman
Weaver
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whitten
Williams (MT)

Williams (OH)
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wyden

Wyllie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zschau

NOES—99

Archer	Gunderson	Oxley
Badham	Hall, Sam	Packard
Bartlett	Hammerschmidt	Parris
Bethune	Hansen (UT)	Pashayan
Billakis	Hartnett	Petri
Biiley	Hiler	Ritter
Broomfield	Hopkins	Roberts
Brown (CO)	Hubbard	Roemer
Broyhill	Hunter	Rogers
Burton (IN)	Hyde	Roukema
Cheney	Kasich	Rudd
Coats	Kemp	Schaefer
Conable	Kindness	Schneider
Corcoran	Kramer	Sensenbrenner
Courter	Lagomarsino	Shumway
Craig	Latta	Shuster
Crane, Daniel	Lewis (CA)	Siljander
Crane, Philip	Lewis (FL)	Slattery
Daniel	Livingston	Smith (NE)
Dannemeyer	Loeffler	Smith, Denny
Daub	Lott	Snyder
DeWine	Lungren	Solomon
Dickinson	Mack	Spence
Dreier	Martin (IL)	Stangeland
Edwards (OK)	McCain	Stenholm
Fiedler	McCandless	Stump
Fields	McCollum	Sundquist
Franklin	McEwen	Taylor
Frenzel	Michel	Thomas (CA)
Gekas	Miller (OH)	Walker
Goodling	Moorhead	Weber
Gramm	Morrison (WA)	Whittaker
Gregg	Nielson	Winn

NOT VOTING—82

Ackerman	Frost	Ortiz
Addabbo	Gephardt	Patman
Alexander	Guarini	Patterson
Aspin	Hall (IN)	Paul
Bereuter	Hance	Pickle
Bevill	Hansen (ID)	Pursell
Bonker	Harrison	Rangel
Bosco	Heftel	Robinson
Boxer	Hightower	Rodino
Bryant	Jacobs	Rostenkowski
Burton (CA)	Jones (NC)	Roth
Campbell	Jones (TN)	Roybal
Chappie	Kaptur	Russo
Clarke	Kazen	Sawyer
Coelho	Kennelly	Shannon
Collins	Kogovsek	Skelton
Conte	LaFalce	Smith (IA)
D'Amours	Lehman (CA)	St. Germain
Daschle	Levine	Stark
Dicks	Lipinski	Stokes
Donnelly	Markey	Traxler
Dymally	Marlenee	Valentine
Edwards (AL)	Marriott	Vucanovich
Emerson	McDade	Weiss
Ferraro	McNulty	Wilson
Foglietta	Miller (CA)	Wright
Ford (TN)	Minish	
Fowler	Nowak	

□ 1830

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Addabbo for, with Mr. Paul against.
Mr. Miller of California for, with Mrs. Vucanovich against.

Mr. Pursell for, with Mr. Marriott against.
Mr. Conte for, with Mr. Chappie against.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year 1985."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter, on H.R. 4974, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I reserve the right to object because it would certainly be unreasonable for me, I suppose, to object to the request, but I am a little bit disturbed about the way that we have proceeded with debate around here today.

What this request is basically all about is to allow Members who never participated in the debate to put material in the RECORD as though they had participated in the debate.

When some of us on the floor today were trying to make points, some on the majority side decided that we should be shut off, that we should be in effect gagged. It is one more example of the kind of tyranny that we see more and more in this House, a tyranny of the majority that says that if you are saying things that they do not like on the House floor, you are to be shut off and gagged by Members on the majority side.

□ 1840

I suggest that that is not the way we ought to be proceeding in debate and some of the very people who are willing to engage in gagging Members of Congress are also the people who parade around the country talking about the need for free speech and talking about the need for extended debate on many, many subjects.

I was extremely disappointed in the character of the debate. I realize that there were some people who did not like the idea that some issues were being raised that they would prefer not to have discussed in some of these issues with regard to the science budget, but that is no reason, it seems to me, to try to impose gag procedures in the debate.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have reserved the right to object simply to inquire of the gentleman from Florida whether or not we can expect the same kind of pattern from the majority side when we debate another controversial bill tomorrow, the NBS. I know the gentleman from Florida did not engage in it. I am not accusing the gentleman from Florida, but it was people from his side who brought about the problem and he unfortunately was the floor leader of those people in this particular debate.

I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FUQUA. Well, I appreciate the gentlemen yielding and I appreciate the exoneration that I was not a participant in that and do not ever intend to be a participant in anything of that kind.

This is the usual procedure of routine so that tables and other things can be included. I know that the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) sought permission to include a letter.

Matters of that type, as the gentleman knows, must have permission in the House to include that.

I have no control over what Members may or may not include in the thing. It was only intended so that I could include some tables and so forth about funding as it related to this bill.

Of course, I granted that privilege to other Members, but if the gentleman would object, I would just ask permission for my own sake.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA)?

Mr. WALKER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, my question to the gentleman was whether or not as floor leader tomorrow, whether or not we can expect some change in the character of the debate which would assure those of us who have amendments to offer and have things to say on the bill that we might expect that his side of the aisle, with the gentleman from Florida as floor leader, would allow full participation in the debate by those of us on the floor and not to go to a debate that ends up being included in the RECORD as though it was actually taking place and Members just deciding what they will say and how they will say it by virtue of written statements.

Mr. FUQUA. Well, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. WALKER. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FUQUA. Let me say that I have no intention to shut off debate. I think that every amendment anybody offered today was made. We offered no attempt to block it. It was an open rule.

I only know of one occasion when I think someone may have objected to someone extending their time beyond the allotted 5 minutes. I did not instruct the Member to do that. As the gentleman well knows, I do not control the Members on this side of the aisle or Members on that side of the aisle. Members are free to express themselves and to interdict the rules any time they choose, but it is not my intention to gag or to in any way engage in any fashion that would restrict the opportunity of Members to express themselves on any side of the issue tomorrow who are seeking to be recognized.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do

so only to say that these matters of unanimous-consent requests that allow these procedures to take place are done within the comity of the House. It is within the comity of the House to be able to request extensions as long as they are not unreasonable extensions when you are debating from the floor of the House as well.

It was this Member who was cut off from debate because I was obviously saying things the majority side did not like to hear, so at that point I was gagged.

I would suggest that if that is going to be a pattern of performance around here, if that is the way in which we are going to behave from the majority side, that the minority side does have as one of its abilities to literally shut off all unanimous-consent requests for any purpose.

As I say, I do not intend to do so here, but I give this as fair warning that if we proceed with this kind of debate pattern in the future, there will be no unanimous-consent requests go through on the House floor and we will see how the House can operate without them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA)?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY CONCERNING THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY AND DEATH SQUADS IN EL SALVADOR

Mr. BOLAND, from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 98-709) on the resolution (H. Res. 467) directing the President of the United States to provide certain information to the House of Representatives concerning the Central Intelligence Agency and death squads in El Salvador, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 91, I am recorded inadvertently as voting "present."

I wish the RECORD to show that I intended to vote "aye" on S. 373, the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1983.

REPORT TO COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES REGARDING TRIP TO GRENADA

(Mr. DELLUMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Mr. GINGRICH, of Georgia, raised

questions about certain Members' involvement in foreign policy.

In the course of the discussion, Mr. GINGRICH referred to me. He unfortunately failed to mention correspondence I had sent to him on the matter. He also failed to note that he had not read the report which was of such interest to him.

For the benefit of Mr. GINGRICH and the House, I am including these in the RECORD:

APRIL 24, 1984.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
U.S. House of Representatives, Longworth
House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR NEWT: I received your letter regarding Congressional involvement in foreign policy in a manner which you believe undermines the effectiveness of the United States.

In your letter, you specifically express your concern about a report about Grenada that I prepared and presented to the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. I believe you might be interested in the factual situation that led to the production of that report.

Secretary of Defense Weinberger, in his 1982 Annual Report to Congress, stated the following: "The Cubans are constructing air and naval facilities on Grenada which far exceed the requirements of that tiny island nation. * * *"

In order to better and more fully understand these allegations, and the potential U.S. policies and options that might follow, I requested the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services to send a delegation to Grenada to review the matter. I was authorized by the Committee to visit the island for a review. Unfortunately, no other Members were available.

I prefaced my on-site inspection with briefings by the Commander, Atlantic Fleet, USN, and the Air Defense Command at Homestead Air Force Base. These briefings occurred on April 7 and 8, 1982. I then went to Grenada with members of my staff, inspected the sites of the supposed Naval base and the commercial airway then under construction (the source of the Secretary's concern), and discussed the issues with Grenadian government leaders. The staff members paid their own way.

Upon my return, I prepared a report for the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. Given the extensive data in the report and with what you know to be my abiding interest in factual accuracy, I requested that one of my aides have the Grenadians verify the factual accuracy of the data included in the report. I assume that you have read the report and therefore are aware of the extent of the factual content. No changes were suggested, and none were made, to our draft. The report, an unclassified document, was then submitted to the Chairman of the Committee.

Since Member reports do not normally circulate, and given the importance of the issue, I had copies of the report made and sent to the Members of the Committee on Armed Services, and some members of the press, at my expense.

Having provided you with this information, which should assure you as to the bona fides of my report and the proper conduct of my staff, let me now turn to what I believe to be a matter of far greater and broader significance. Your special order, whether intended or not, has a frightening-

ly chilling impact upon our democratic heritage of public discourse and debate, both on the individual Members of Congress and the institution.

The Congress is a co-equal branch of government. It has a moral and constitutional responsibility to look behind the pronouncements of the executive branch and independently to ascertain the facts. Error unchallenged remains error. To neglect our responsibility is to neglect the Constitution itself.

My views on Grenada are public and well known. My public and private expressions, whether to my colleagues, the executive branch, the press or the public, have been consistent and honest. We, you and I, disagree on this issue, but we have the right to disagree. It is a fundamental prerogative of citizens and indeed our duty as Members of Congress, charged with the responsibility for guiding this nation, to air our various views in the development and pursuit of our policies.

I trust this is of assistance. Candidly, I have found the repeated questions and assertions regarding the matter unworthy of response. In response to your inquiry, however, I will make this letter public.

Sincerely,

RONALD V. DELLUMS,
Member of Congress.

REPORT TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES BY RONALD V. DELLUMS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, CONCERNING CONGRESSMAN DELLUMS' TRIP TO GRENADA FROM APRIL 13 THROUGH APRIL 15, 1982

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 14, 1982.

HON. MELVIN PRICE,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is with pleasure that I submit the following report for your review, consideration and acceptance. My recent trip to Grenada proved not only rewarding but also successful and beneficial. This report is intended to give an overview of the military questions and concerns of the United States as well as an objective assessment of factual information regarding Grenada and the building of the new international airport.

It is my hope that, when printed, every member of the Committee will consider this material valuable and will refer to it as a precedent to seek the truth and present constructive arguments against many misconceptions regarding our relationship with Grenada.

Thank you in advance for your continued cooperation. Should you have further questions and/or comments, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

RONALD V. DELLUMS,
Member of Congress.

To: Honorable Melvin Price, Chairman,
Committee on Armed Services.
From: Ronald V. Dellums, Member, Committee on Armed Services.
Subject: Fact finding mission—Grenada.

INTRODUCTION

In my capacity as a Member of the House Armed Services Committee, I conducted a fact finding mission to the Eastern Caribbean Island of Grenada from April 13 through April 15, 1982. Accompanying me were the following members of my staff: Mrs. Barbara Lee-Chisom, Ms. Carlotta Scott and

Mr. John Apperson. Prior to departing on April 7, 1982, I traveled to Norfolk, Virginia, the Atlantic Fleet Command Headquarters. Ms. Marilyn Elrod and Mr. Robert Brauer of my staff accompanied me to this briefing. In addition, prior to departure for Grenada, I was briefed on April 8, 1982 by the Air Defense Command for the Caribbean at Homestead Air Force Base.

PURPOSE OF TRIP

Secretary of Defense, Caspar Weinberger, in his 1982 Annual Report to the Congress stated the following: "Cuba has not only been active in Nicaragua and El Salvador, but has also coordinated clandestine support organizations in Honduras, Costa Rica and Guatemala. In fact, convincing evidence of Cuban subversion has surfaced in virtually every Caribbean Basin country. In Grenada, Cuban influence has reached such a high level that Grenada can be considered a Cuban Satellite. The Cubans are constructing air and naval facilities on Grenada, which far exceed the requirements of that tiny island nation." Mr. Weinberger makes these comments in the context of the challenge to the western hemisphere that he alleges is posed by the USSR, Cuba, Grenada, and Nicaragua. Given this statement, I journeyed to Grenada to meet with government and airport development officials to discuss the purpose and nature of the proposed airport. In addition to discussions and site visits to the airport, I looked at the site of the alleged submarine base which, according to British sources, is being developed as a military harbor for use by the Cubans.

BRIEFINGS: THE MILITARY SITUATION

In an effort to better understand the specific situation regarding Grenada, on April 7, 1982, I visited the headquarters of the Atlantic Fleet. The Atlantic Fleet Commander has authority over U.S. and NATO units in the Atlantic and Caribbean area. Following an extensive and comprehensive briefing I came away with the absolute impression that nothing being done in Grenada constitutes a threat to the United States or her allies. There is particularly, no concern regarding the new international airport currently under construction in Grenada.

The Atlantic Fleet Commander stated that the new international airport is a Military non sequitor.

On April 8, 1982, in continuing my effort to better assess specifics regarding the U.S. military position with respect to the construction of the airport in Grenada, I visited Homestead Air Force Base, home of the Air Defense Command. I was briefed by high level officials and was again assured that that the airport in Grenada is of no consequence to the United States and has not now or ever presented a threat to the security of the U.S.

MEETINGS

On Tuesday, April 13, I met with the Prime Minister Maurice Bishop and the Deputy Prime Minister, Bernard Coard. Our discussions centered around the aforementioned issues.

Regarding the proposed naval base, I was told that the site in question was the Calivigny Inlet (see appendix 1) which has a tightly restricted area called Egmont Harbor. It is the area which is said to be off limits to all but Cuban technical advisors due to the construction of a possible submarine base.

The Prime Minister indicated to me that the inlet is too shallow to admit or accommodate large boats, and the only restricted area was Egmont Harbor where Camp

Feldon, a military installation is located. My request to visit this site was granted and my observations are noted.

During this meeting, the Prime Minister also indicated to me that since 1955, studies have been conducted which conclude that the current airport retards the potential economic growth of the island. Tourism is the island's second largest industry and is greatly impeded by the current airport which has a 5,000 foot runway, cannot accommodate large planes and has no night landing. In addition, I was told that the airport is needed for trade purposes. Mr. Bishop indicated that Point Salines, the site of the airport now under construction, is the only site on the island where such an airport can be built due to the mountainous terrain of the country.

In sum, the Prime Minister and Deputy Prime Minister reiterated Grenada's position with regard to the new international airport. It is needed for the economic development of the island and not for military uses as has been stated by the Department of Defense, Department of State and the CIA.

AIRPORT BACKGROUND

Grenada is one of the smallest independent nations in the Western Hemisphere. It has a total land mass of only 133 square miles, 344 square kilometers, a population of 110,000 and a per capita GDP of \$400 (US). The state of Grenada consists of the island of Grenada and a number of offshore islands known as the Grenadines, Carriacou and Petit Martinique.

Geologically, Grenada is not endowed with any known mineral resources. Its economy has evolved around agriculture and tourism. Chief exports are nutmeg, bananas and cocoa. As one of the most beautiful islands of the Caribbean, the development of tourism is the second largest earner of foreign exchange next to agriculture.

With such limited natural resources, Grenada seeks development through the building of an international airport, which is considered the most important project in the country's economic history. The construction of the new airport is the largest and most important project thus far undertaken by the Peoples Revolutionary Government.

The idea of an international airport dates back to British colonial rule when the British economic experts first suggested such an initiative in 1954. Feasibility studies were subsequently carried out (by the British) in 1969. Studies by the World Bank, 1976 and 1977 confirmed that Grenada needed a modern airport and that the best site would be the southern peninsula or Point Salines, site of current construction. It should be noted that previous governments, before the present government, the PRG, ignored these studies and no attempts were ever made to construct a new and more modern airport of Grenada.

The existing airport, Pearls, the only airstrip on the mainland of Grenada, is situated on the east coast of the island, 2.5 kilometers north of Grenville, the second largest population center. The distance, by road, to St. Georges, the Capital, is approximately 45 minutes to one hour by car (20 miles). The airfield was opened to traffic in January, 1943; extended in 1948 to accommodate DC 3 passenger Dakota aircraft; widened and lengthened in 1964/65 to accommodate the 50 passenger Viscount aircraft; strengthened in 1973/74 to accommodate the BAC-111, 100 seater jet aircraft which was then flown by Court Lines of the

United Kingdom. LIAT (Leeward Island Air Transport), prior to the introduction of the BAC-111 and since the demise of Court Lines, flies an HS 748, 48 passenger craft and is the main carrier used to make connections to Grenada. Pearls runway has paved length of 1,600 meters, 5,250 feet and is oriented 08-26 magnetic, with take off and landing predominantly in 08 to the east. The airport is surrounded by heavily wooded and hilly terrain except to the east where it is open to the sea. The site is marginally suitable for daylight hours and under good weather conditions. This runway does not meet ICAO (International Civil Aviation Organization) standards. The most notable deficiencies are as follows: The width of the airstrip is 300 ft. vs. the recommended 500 ft.; the approach slope to the runway 08 is approximately 1:11 vs. the recommended 1:20 for daylight operations; and the longitudinal slope exceeds the recommended 1 percent for a class B runway.

In addition, the hills surrounding this site make night landing and/or instrument approach operations an impossibility. The lack of night landing facilities and the lack of potential for further development identify Pearls as a major constraint to air traffic and tourism development in Grenada. The basic problems with this airstrip is the steep curved approach path that an aircraft must fly to maintain adequate terrain clearance over the hills. As there are no approved procedure for such an approach, pilots must assess flight situation on an individual basis.

Recognizing the potential impact of the airport, the PRG began seeking funding for the project in September of 1979, approaching the U.S., European, Arab and Caribbean countries for assistance. In a gesture of friendship and solidarity, Cuba gave vital aid, providing technical expertise, construction equipment, skilled labor and materials such as steel and concrete. Help also came from the Arab countries which contributed \$50 million (EC) and Venezuela which gave 10,000 barrels of diesel fuel. The EEC held a co-financing conference to seek funds. Only the U.S. refused to assist and to date still remains silent. Cuban assistance made the project a reality and construction teams of Cubans and Grenadians work and live together at the airport site. Statistics for the new international airport are as follows:

Proposed runway length: 2,743 meters (9,000 feet), Proposed width: 45 meters (150 feet).

Aircraft design: B 747.

Worked Commenced: January 1980.

Target Dates for completion (Operational runway only): 1,500 meters (5,000 feet), 1983 First Quarter; 2,740 meters (9,000 feet), 1984 First Quarter.

Estimated Total Cost: \$192 Million (EC) (\$71 Million US) (see attach. IV).

Number of workers: Cuban: 250, Grenadian 360.

During the April 13, 1982 meeting in which I discussed with the Prime Minister and Deputy Prime Minister the purpose of my visit to Grenada, I asked and given permission to inspect and observe the construction of the new international airport at Point Salines. The Prime Minister expressed his desire to afford me every opportunity to evaluate the nature and purpose of the airport. He also expressed his desire to ally any and all misconceptions regarding its construction stating that "this is the most important undertaking in Grenada's economic history" and is only for the potential development of Grenada's second largest source of foreign exchange, tourism.

The following outlines aspects of the full impact of the development potential of the new international airport as was explained by the Deputy Prime Minister, who is also the Minister of Finance and Trade:

Grenada possesses the greatest potential for tourism development in the Caribbean today. Various independent sources including the World Bank have confirmed this potential. The World Bank's Tourism Sector review and Project Identification Visit of September 11-22, 1976, states:

"Grenada is one of the most attractive islands in the Caribbean. Its excellent beaches are backed by spectacular mountain scenery, rich with lush vegetation. Its harbour at St. George's, the Capital, is rated the prettiest in the islands and serves both as a port-of-call for cruise ships as well as a centre for yachting in the Grenadines. The climate is warm with a pleasant seabreeze throughout the year. In short, Grenada fulfills most people's image of a tropical paradise."

This image is supported by the European Tourism Demand Study conducted by Steinberger Consulting on the Caribbean Product of 1980. It should be pointed out that Grenada possesses ideal hotel sites on numerous white sand beaches yet to be developed—in close proximity to the proposed international airport and main shopping centre.

Today, however, it has been very difficult, if not impossible, to begin to realize the full tourism potential because of the following handicaps:

(i) The present inadequate airport facilities which can accommodate no passenger aircraft larger than the Avro 748 Turbo-prop with a maximum capacity of 48 passengers;

(ii) The absence or lack of night-landing facilities. This means that all flights into Grenada must arrive before darkness falls thereby limiting or restricting the number of flights into Grenada;

(iii) Because most international airline flights into the Caribbean arrive at our two major connecting points, Barbados and Trinidad, in the very late afternoon or early evening, passengers bound for Grenada are forced to overnight at either of these two points. This factor causes these passengers great inconvenience and extra unnecessary expenditure. Estimates show that approximately 50% of annual visitors overnight at these points at an approximate cost of US \$85 per person resulting in the loss to Grenada of US \$1.3 million (EC\$ 3.5 million);

(iv) Because of the extreme difficulty experienced by Travel Agents and tour Operators in obtaining confirmed bookings for their clients between Barbados and Grenada, many of them have discontinued selling Grenada as a destination to their clients. This is especially true in countries where Consumer Protection Laws hold the Travel Agents liable for confirmed travel arrangements sold that did not materialize;

(v) Despite being the only country among twenty-six Caribbean countries given top ratings (in the European Tourism Demand Study 1980) on natural attractions, Beaches and Climate, yet in that study Grenada was designated a Touristically Disadvantaged Destination as a result of "Accessibility problems; no gateway airport for flights . . ."

Furthermore, the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) in its Circular Report 141-a-46 of 1978 states:

"Caribbean traffic growth and changes in aircraft technology require the continued

expansion of existing facilities and raise the problem of financing such development. In general terms it can be said that the absence of at least one runway of not less than 3,000 m (9,800 ft.) in a country restricts the operation of long-haul international services with modern equipment and is a potential limiting factor on the development of a pattern that fully meets the transport requirements of a country."

Trends in the airline industry (including deregulation of airlines) are resulting in a change to wide-bodied jet aircraft and other Caribbean destinations have had to upgrade their facilities to keep abreast of these developments, and as a result they have experienced a marked increase in stay-over visitors every year while Grenada with its limited and restricted airport facilities have shown very little increase if any, as can be seen by the following:

STAY-OVER VISITORS STATISTICS

Grenada: 30,426; 37,933; 33,490; 32,336; 29,434.

St. Lucia: 29,529 42,399; 45,809; 69,300; 85,000.

It should be noted that St. Lucia's International Airport at Hewanorra came into operation in 1972.

It is believed, that the establishment of an international airport in Grenada will bring many benefits to the country and its people. Such benefits would include:

New Hotel Development.—On information from the Deputy Prime Minister, investors have expressed and some have actually submitted proposals for the development of new hotels on the numerous beach sites on the island. This would mean more employment for people of Grenada both skilled and unskilled during the construction period and also more permanent employment for the people required to service the hotels and their guests after their completion. He also stated that is significant to note that present local hotel owners and other local entrepreneurs have already presented concrete proposals to the Government for expansion of existing facilities as well as the establishment of new ancillary projects.

In continuing Mr. Coard explained that just as interesting is the fact that seven proposals to the government of Grenada for the establishment and operation of "Air Grenada" and preliminary approaches from five major international airlines for landing rights have been made contingent on the establishment of an international airport.

Explaining further, he stated that separate and distinct offers from many different groups of investors from the United States, Canada, Britain have been submitted, proposing the establishment of a national carrier to bring large numbers of tourists from Western Europe, and North America, directly into Grenada.

This is apart from five major international airlines which have made preliminary approaches with respect to the question of landing rights when the international airport comes on stream—Airlines which do not have planes for landing on a strip of only 5,000 ft. or 1,500 m. but are interested in landing rights only on the completion of the full international airport of 2,750 meters or 9,000 ft.

Agricultural and Fishing Development.—With the increased number of hotel guests expected to come to Grenada there will be provided a ready market for the development of agricultural products and fishing industry in order to feed these guests and so the inter-sector linkages and the multiplier

effects within the economy would be felt as a result to the expansion of the tourism sector.

Cultural Development.—The increased activity in tourist development would create a demand for entertainment at hotels and other establishments. This would serve as an incentive to our people to fully realize their cultural potential and establish a truly national identity.

Ancillary Development.—Other areas of development which the international airport will generate substantial and significant economic activity include the restaurant business, yachting and other water sports, taxi service and overland tours, shopping both specialized and general, and to a very large degree dealers in foodstuffs, liquor, craftwork and other commodities used directly and indirectly in the tourist industry.

With the establishment of an international airport projected to open in 1983 and with the increased marketing and promotional efforts by the Grenada Department of Tourism, it is anticipated with good justification that there will be a significant increase in stay-over visitor arrivals and are projected as follows:

Year	G'da optimistic projections	G'da pessimistic projections	Percent of Caribbean total
1981	34,800	33,200	0.4
1982	36,400	34,000	.4
1983	57,600	52,800	.6
1984	60,600	54,600	.6
1985	84,800	74,400	.8
1986	88,800	76,800	.8
1987	117,000	99,000	1.0
1988	122,000	120,000	1.0
1989	129,000	105,000	1.0
1990	135,000	108,000	1.0

In addition to the construction of an international airport, concrete steps have been taken by the government to stimulate the development of a viable tourist industry.

The restructured Tourist Organization creates for the first time a Department of Tourism budget from (EC \$150,000 to EC \$700,000 in a space of one year representing an increase of approx. 500 percent with the emphasis in that budget placed on aggressive marketing and promotion.

The establishment of tourist offices for the first time in two major tourist markets—North America and Europe.

Conscious of the extreme difficulty of getting visitors to Grenada from connection points in the Eastern Caribbean, the Government has recently purchased a Banderanti Commuter aircraft at a cost of (US) \$1.5 million which has been leased to LIAT.

A Grenada Interline desk has been established at the Grantley Adams International airport in Barbados to facilitate Grenada bound passengers interlining from international flights.

The Prime Minister went on to explain the existing facilities at Pearls Airfield much as are outlined in the background section of this report. He further stressed the need for the new airport given the adverse conditions and deficiencies associated with Pearls.

PROPOSALS FOR AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT

The Deputy Prime Minister detailed proposals for airport development which date as far back as January 1955, when the Scott Wilson Kirkpatrick & Partners, a British firm in their report on "Airfields for Grenada and St. Vincent" recommended strongly

in favour of the Point Salines site in view of the need for a site which would cater for aircraft of the size and class of Viscount (55 passenger) aircraft and larger.

He stated that in July 1960, the now defunct federal government of the West Indies appointed a Commission to report on Civil Aviation in the West Indies. In their report, the Commissioners identified Point Salines as the logical choice for future airport development in Grenada and recommended that "construction be started as soon as conveniently possible."

In 1960, he continued the governments of UK, USA and Canada established a "Tripartite Economic Commission" to carry out a survey of the Windward and Leeward Islands, including Grenada, then referred to as the "Little Eight" islands, in order to "identify the obstacles to economic growth in the islands and the priorities in terms of expenditures and policies required to remove them."

As a follow-up to the Tripartite Economic Survey of UK, USA and Canada, the Department of Transport of the Canadian Government undertook a "Study Paper on Airports for Leeward and Windward Islands" and published their report in March 1967. Following on recommendation for the more northerly of the Islands the Department indicated that "the proposed jet airports on St. Lucia and Grenada have also been assigned top priorities." The report recommended development of the airport in three stages,

Stage 1 Viscount, BAC-111, DC-9, B-737 type operations—5,500 ft.

Stage 2 Jet operations—medium range, extending the airport of Point Salines to 7,500 ft.

Stage 3 jet operations—long range, extending that airport of Point Salines further to 9,000 ft.

Of the juncture, it is important to appreciate that the idea, for an international airport at Point Salines, did not come from the present Government of Grenada, but has been the dream of successive Governments of Grenada, for 26 years.

It is important also to note that the concept of an airport of 9,000 ft. long is not some idea first conceived by the present Government in the last years, but has come up repeatedly in different reports of different countries that have studied this problem, including the United States. The report from the Canadian government Transportation Department suggested three stages for the development of Point Salines Airport.

The Deputy Prime Minister went on to explain that in January 1969, Scott Wilson Kirkpatrick & Partners jointly with the Economist Intelligence Unit, both of London were commissioned by the British Ministry of Overseas Development at the request of the government of Grenada to carry out an Economic and Technical Feasibility Study which was produced in 2 volumes.

The report, entitled "An Economic and Technical Feasibility Study", four possible alignments were studied, and the results of soil and topographic surveys including marine borings were presented. It was a well-executed study and while these investigations were repeated in considerably greater detail by the Cuban/Grenadian team in late 1979/80, nothing emerged during the investigations or in the sixteen-month of construction work to date, at Point Salines which is in conflict with the findings of the 1969 feasibility report.

The engineering feasibility study—including all of the soil and rock samples, and marine borings by the Scott Wilson Kirkpatrick & Partners team which were executed as a study, and thoroughly documented and detailed, but in addition, 9 volumes intensive and even more comprehensive and detailed engineering feasibility study undertaken by a team of more than 20 Cuban and Grenadian technical experts in this field confirmed all of these findings. The summary of the report of Scott Wilson Kirkpatrick and the Economic Intelligence Unit confirmed once more that the "most likely alternative existed in the construction of an airport on a new site at Point Salines."

Like the Canadian study, this report envisaged a stage development, a first stage of 5,800 ft., a second stage of 7,800 ft. which was stipulated for the Lockheed L1011, and the possibility of development to 9,000 ft. in a later stage.

The report, too, looked at the development of Point Salines airport into an international airport in three stages ending with the final stage of 9,000 ft.

Earlier in 1968, the Operational Services Overseas Branch of the Board of Trade, London, which body then exercised responsibility for the flight operational aspects of airports (at that time Grenada was a colony of Britain), reported on Pearls Airport and on the proposed new airport at Point Salines.

They reported on all the operational aspects related to Point Salines and Messrs. Scott Wilson Kirkpatrick & Partners in their 1969 feasibility report on Point Salines record that "Advice was sought throughout from the Operational Services Overseas Branch of the Department of Civil Aviation of the Board of Trade on all operational matters likely to affect the physical standards to be adopted for the airport layout and the proposals put forward comply with their recommendations."

In 1970/71—Scott Wilson Kirkpatrick & Partners undertook an Engineering Feasibility Study of the Pearls crosswind runway proposal. This reported favorably on the crosswind runway but the results of the report were considered doubtful when assessed by Crown Agents (UK) Engineers, Airline pilots, and Grenadian Ministry Engineers who were experienced in this field. Ultimately, it was identified that the wind data made available to the consultants had been faulty because of faulty instrumentation and that the proposal for a crosswind runway was not a sound one.

In 1972, yet another study of Grenada's airport was commissioned by the British Overseas Development Ministry. This was in fact, an updating of the economic feasibility aspects of the 1969 report.

In May/June 1976, proposals for nightflying at Pearls, Grenada and Arnos Vale, St. Vincent were prepared by the Civil Aviation Authority, London, and presented to local authorities. The regional airline LIAT, and the Airline Pilots Association, accepted the proposals for the lighting of the airport at St. Vincent, but rejected the proposals for Pearls airport, Grenada because of safety considerations bearing in mind the unfavorable topography and the need to use a steep curved approach path for landing.

In other words, no possibility whatever of Grenada being able to have even night-landing, even without an international airport, but just night-landing with the existing 5,000 ft. at the present airport at Pearls.

In September 1976, and again in December 1976, the World Bank sent an Identifica-

tion and Appraisal Mission to Grenada to look specifically at the Airport Development Project. The team comprising of an aviation engineer, an aviation economist and a general economist, reviewed the various alternatives possible, and concluded:

"That the existing runway at Pearls acted and would continue to act as a constraint on the development of air transport and tourism growth" and

"That taking into consideration the country's needs, constraints and development potential, the Point Salines site for a new airport would best serve Grenada's needs and further study should concentrate on this site to determine its overall technical, economic and financial feasibility."

The World Bank team recommended that yet, another technical and economic feasibility study be undertaken.

Finally, in late 1979, the Government of Grenada acting on advice from a panel of Caribbean Technical experts who had been invited to advise on the matter meteorological experts from Barbados, civil aviation experts from the region, in charge of airports of the region, of the Caribbean routes, Venezuelan engineers, Cuban engineers, Grenadian engineers experience in building airports, including the engineer who built St. Vincent's airport, pilots from BWIA from LIAT another airline, a panel of people representing all the different fields, and who had studied all these former reports. It is this team of experts which finally advised the Government of Grenada to end the studies and start the work. Therefore the decision to proceed with runway construction at Point Salines was taken. Initially, a draft master plan updating the proposals contained in the 1969 Joint Scott Wilson Kirkpatrick & Partners and Economist Intelligence Unit (UK) feasibility study was prepared by a Joint Cuba/Grenada team and construction commenced based upon this in January 1980.

The master plan envisaged a runway construction in two stages, the first being to have a runway 2,400 m (7,800 ft.) long with the Boeing 727 as the design aircraft and with the feasibility of extending to 2,750 m (9,000 ft.) to accommodate DC-10, L-1011 and Boeing 747 when the demand warranted it. This was, essentially, the 1969 UK Consultants Proposals displaced by the 10 year intervening period.

However, airline operators servicing the routes on which the bulk of the tourist traffic and potential for growth lie—Europe and North America—are replacing the aircraft currently in use (B 707 class aircraft) and they are replacing that type of aircraft with wide bodied jet aircraft, eg B-747, DC-10, L-1011, and this has been the current experience in St. Lucia, Antigua and Barbados. As a result, in mid 1980, Government took the decision to construct the full length of 2,750 m during the present phase of construction.

Although it is to be in two stages, nevertheless there will be an element concurrent between stages 1 and 2, so that upon completion the entire 9,000 ft. would be available in order to accommodate the shift-over by most airlines away from the B-707 class of aircraft to the larger the more wide-bodied long-haul jets of the 747, DC-10, L-1011.

The runway will be approximately 2,750 m long, 1,500 m of which will be open to traffic, including night operations, during the 1982/83 tourist season.

A 2,750 m runway when completed is intended to provide facilities recommended by ICAO up to the level of an Instrument Approach runway.

In the provisional stage, the 1,500 m runway will accommodate aircraft of the class of the US-748 turbo-prop currently operated by LIAT, while a 2,750 m runway will be generally to ICAO Code letter A specifications.

International Airport site visit

Following my meeting with the Prime Minister and Deputy Prime Minister, I was driven to the construction site of the new international airport. Upon arrival, my staff and I were met by Mr. Ronald G. Smith, International Airport Project Manager, who introduced us to an assistant who was engaged in negotiations with a group of contractors from Great Britain, France and Finland. We were told that the negotiations were for the installation of equipment and systems for the airport.

As we viewed a model of the completed airport site which was enclosed in glass, Mr. Smith explained to use the process of developing this site. As Point Salines was identified as the only viable site on the island which could be developed into an airport with nightlanding and flying facilities and capable of accommodating wide bodied aircraft, this site had to undergo quite a physical transition. The runway, currently under construction, had to be built across a body of water, Hardy Bay, which is approximately 425 meters wide and approximately 8 meters deep. The bay had a layer of unstable material which had to be removed by suction dredge and discarded, then pumped and deposited between two dykes which were built after the removal of much material. The dredging process, one of two major phases of the site, cost approximately \$3 million (US). The firm contracted for this dredging project in Lane Dredging, Co., a United States firm of specialists based in Miami, Florida. (photos attached)

It was explained that the site comprises a promontory on which a number of extremely steep sided spurs ran at right angles to the required and only feasible center direction of the runway. The soil, organic clay and clay stratas, was hard and had to be loosened with explosives. It is interesting to note that the explosives used to blast the terrain were made of molasses and nitro. From the photographs shown us of the site in its various stages of development, it seems, in my estimation, to be a project of great undertaking and great potential.

My staff and I were escorted by Mr. Smith and other project personnel to the runway which is slated to be operational by the Spring of 1983. It is hoped that the first 5000 ft. will be ready for use for normal LIAT flights within the next nine months. The runway will, upon completion be 2743 meters in length. Mr. Smith stated that the actual length needed to accommodate a 747 is 3000 meters according to International Aviation specifications standards. He further explained the phases of the construction activity of the project. The dredging process as was mentioned earlier in the airport background and the surfacing of the runway. A third activity, related to these phases he explained is putting into operation a Quarry, Rock crushing Plant and Asphalt Plant which is necessary to produce the asphaltic concrete for paving the runway. The Asphalt Plant was officially opened during the March 13th Anniversary Celebrations this year.

Surfacing of the runway began in September 1981. A total of five layers of varying layers of thicknesses have already been completed and work has begun on the aircraft parking apron where future passen-

gers will embark and disembark aircraft. Plans for the terminal have been prepared and are under consideration.

While viewing the airport construction site, it was particularly interesting to note a medical student from the nearby Medical University jogging in the area, as well as a busload of children visiting the site from a Parish school in addition to many visitors simply observing the beautiful view of the sea. (The Western end of the point at which the Caribbean and Atlantic oceans meet and from where we stood was quite a lovely view). Mr. Smith explained that with the University so near the construction site that all blasting which was conducted to level to site was done so in a manner to ensure no damage to either buildings or individuals.

Upon departing the runway site we were then driven to a training school which was established on the airport site and is operated by a team of Cuban and Grenadian instructors. It was explained that recruits for driving, mechanic, drill operator and equipment operator are given instruction in safety and theory for a period of 2 to 6 weeks after which practical training commences. Truck drivers are required a minimum of 6 weeks training and are required to have a Grenada drivers license and minimum of three years driving experience before they are accepted.

Mr. Smith stated that there are currently 250 Cuban workers and 360 Grenadian workers employed on the entire airport project:

(1) Contractors; Plessey Airports, Ltd., United Kingdom; Tompson, CSF, France; Metex, Ltd. Finland.

Items being negotiated: radio and communications equipment; navigational aid equipment; lighting facilities for the runway; fire engines; fitting for the terminal.

Calivigny Inlet site visit

I personally visited the site of the proposed submarine or naval base. I rode up the dirt road for about 1 mile prior to reaching the restricted area. Camp Feldon, a military installation, is located in this restricted area. The camp is where firing practices, a public announcement is made over the local radio station to warn fishermen to stay out of the area.

On the eastern side, I noticed a paved road leading to the point, Ft. Jeudy. On the western side, I noticed several members of the Peoples Revolutionary Army alongside the road as well as what appeared to be army barracks.

My visit to the site, the Calivigny Inlet, showed no construction nor shipping. The area has an unrestricted sea coast with no posted restricted area, except for the west side of Egmont Harbor, into which the inlet runs, which again, is the location of Camp Feldon. I rode alongside Egmont Harbor and noticed many well-kept homes with views of this entire area. It clearly isn't hidden. This inlet was too shallow to admit boats larger than schooners. I was told that the government may develop this area as a yacht marina.

Upon my request, I was driven up the paved road to Ft. Jeudy and noticed several large homes owned by both Granadians and foreigners. I stood at the point of Ft. Jeudy and could see with no obstacles, the entire Calivigny Inlet, including Egmont Harbor and Camp Feldon. The residential areas of Lans Aux Pines and Westerhall were both visible.

There were no signs of any construction or naval activity, nor did my findings and

observations conclude that this is a tightly restricted area for use by the Cubans or Soviets. Factual information about this area was readily available.

My staff and I departed Grenada on April 15. Upon our arrival in Barbados I had an opportunity to pay a courtesy call to our representative to the Eastern Caribbean. In the absence of Ambassador Milan Bish, Deputy Ambassador Ludlow Flowers and I had an extremely stimulating and interesting exchange on the important events and issues regarding the region: the President's recent visit to Barbados, the Caribbean Basin Initiative and the state of United States-Grenada relations.

VIEWS—UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

During the past 5 years, the Caribbean has become a region of increasingly political and strategic interest. In his statement to members of the board of Trustees of the Caribbean Central American Action in 1980, former President Jimmy Carter stated that the economies of this area are quite vulnerable to the intrusion of alien forces which have created an open avenue for Cuban adventurism. President Reagan, in his February 24, 1982 speech to the Organization of American States stated "The well-being and security of our neighbors in this region are in our own vital interest".

The Caribbean Basin Initiative is the United States response to the political, military and economic needs of the Caribbean. It is my contention that this response was totally inappropriate and did not speak to the economic and social needs of the region. It spoke to the military and security needs of Central America, specifically El Salvador. The Congressional Black Caucus, of which I am a member, presented testimony to the subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade and the subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs which outlined specific issues which require critical examination in this initiative. Specifically, of extreme concern was the exclusion of certain Caribbean countries, including Grenada, due to ideological differences.

With regard to Grenada, President Reagan characterized it as a totalitarian left government and while in Barbados during his recent vacation, stated that Grenada "now bears the Soviet and Cuban trademark, which means that it will attempt to spread the virus among its neighbors." According to press accounts, the President indicated that Grenada's inclusion in the Caribbean Basin Initiative would require a change in policies and behavior.

As I have stated before in this report, of extreme concern to the United States is the construction of a new international airport in Grenada. Official and unofficial reports have stated that this airport is being built by the Cubans for military rather than tourism purposes.

Taking the above views of the United States government into account, I believed that it was critical that the Armed Services committee and the United States Congress be presented a factual report on Grenada and its perceived military threat to this country.

Although the Grenadians consider this the most important project in their history, the United States response came swiftly and angrily, denouncing the new airport as a military project, the brainchild of Cuba who would wish to use it as a Soviet launch site. In the fall of 1980 the Reagan Administration cited the Grenada Revolution as indeed a case of Soviet-Cuban aggression in the Western Hemisphere when the Grenadian-

Cuban cooperation on the airport project began. According to the Administration this was a cooperation of "Cuban expansionism." The State Department and the Pentagon have described the airport as "airfield much larger than the small islands' tourist industry will require" and assert that "with its strategic location, the airfield could serve as a staging area and refueling stop for Cuban troops on the way to Africa or South America and another Soviet base in the Western Hemisphere capable of servicing Soviet bombers, including the new supersonic backfire." (1. film "Attack on the Americas," produced by the American Security Council Foundation; quotes by State Department and Pentagon experts). There was no mention, however, that six Eastern Caribbean islands have airports of equal or greater size or that Cuban troops have been reaching Africa since 1975 without any assistance from Grenada. (Attachment I and IA airport lengths of other islands).

The United States government also attempted to levy pressure on its western allies to boycott a co-financing conference held in Brussels in April 1982. However, all scheduled representatives attended the meeting and most of the requested funds for further development of the airport were pledged by Scandinavia, Nigeria and the EEC (European Economic Community). Claude Cheysson, Commissioner for Developing Countries, described Grenada's request for aid as "entirely normal". The only abnormal thing is the American interest. . . . This decision is a decision for the EEC and Grenada." (See attachment II—list of contributors) (See attachment II-A—list of contributors).

The Administration's attempt to economically squeeze Grenada has drawn criticism from diverse sectors. The Caribbean Conference of Churches as well as the 12 countries of CARICOM of the English speaking Caribbean issued statements of strong condemnation against the United States. Also, 61 member countries of the African, Caribbean and Pacific States (ACP) endorsed a resolution supporting construction of Grenada's international airport and denounced United States pressure against the project.

Based on my own experience while in Grenada, the most determined supporters of the airport are the Grenadian people themselves, who have purchased \$850,000 (EC) worth of airport bonds to help finance the construction and have formed local airport development committees to help raise funds. Pledges have come from every sector of the society: unions, farmers, women, youth, and the Church and community groups. (Attachment III—airport bond) Members of my staff attended a fundraiser sponsored by the Women's Airport Development Committee on Sunday, April 11. They noted, during a briefing session afterward, that a broad based and diverse sector of the population participated in this event. Of particular interest to the staff was the active participation of Grenada's elderly i.e. selling tickets, serving food, greeting guests, and accompanying newcomers around the airport complex.

OBSERVATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on my personal observations, discussions and analysis of the new international airport under construction in Grenada, it is my conclusion that this project is specifically, now and has always been for the purpose of the economic development of Grenada and IS NOT intended for military use as has been stated by United States Administration officials. Given the facts and

figures as presented by our own military experts and by the Grenadians as well, it is my thought that it is absurd, patronizing and totally unwarranted for the United States Government to charge that this airport is for military purposes and a threat to our national security. Moreover, the use of such allegations by the United States as the basis for a foreign policy of confrontation toward Grenada is counterproductive. Inasmuch as the United States has not and does not intend to contribute financially or otherwise to the construction of the airport and given that this airport does not and will not threaten the United States or her allies (within the hemisphere or elsewhere), it is my contention that our government should be officially unconcerned with the airport in Grenada.

The economic and social development of this tiny, poor island nation will depend in large on the completion of this airport and the United States should in no way attempt to undermine Grenada's pursuit of further development. The long range impact of this project for Grenada's economy far extends the short term rhetoric that is exhibited toward the initiative. Having witnessed the construction process and the commitment of the workers and that of the Government and peoples of Grenada I am convinced of its economic importance. I am, further, in agreement with others of the international community, the EEC, the World Bank and all who have studied, at length, the feasibility of this project, that this new airport is a priority undertaking for the survival of the country. It in addition, in my opinion provides the greatest development potential for Grenada.

President Reagan in his February 24 statement to the Organization of American States stated that Grenada is a "totalitarian left regime" and while in Barbados during the same period as my fact finding trip to Grenada, stated that Grenada is a country that "now bears the Soviet-Cuban trademark, which means that it will attempt to spread the virus among its neighbors". It is my contention that such rhetoric is apparently used to enhance the validity of the allegations regarding military development. Based on my briefings by both the Commanders of the Atlantic Fleet and the Air Defense Command who emphatically assured me that the airport under construction in Grenada is of no military consequence to the United States, my question to my colleagues is why then the continued rhetoric against Grenada? It seems obvious that there are far more underlying circumstances that surround the issue of United States-Grenada relations than meet the eye.

It is my sincere hope that my colleagues of the Armed Services Committee and of Congress at large will read, assess and evaluate this report and use it as a basis for a critique of the Administration's hostile and hegemonistic policy toward Grenada. More importantly, I hope it will be used as a foundation for a more constructive, conciliatory policy toward a tiny island nation that is deserving of not only the assistance and cooperation of the United States but also of our friendship.

I wish to thank the Chairman, the Commanders of the Atlantic Fleet and Air Defense Command, the Government and People of Grenada for providing me the opportunity to fully evaluate the military aspects and concerns regarding the construction of the international airport in Grenada. Further, I appreciate the opportunity to present my findings and analyses and more

importantly hope that this mission will serve as a precedent for others to seek the truth, present fair and constructive arguments against unfounded and unwarranted misconceptions, and attempt to educate the American public on all aspects of the issues.

[Attachment No. 1]

ANNOTATED DATA ON SELECTED CARIBBEAN AIRPORTS

Destination	Area (square miles)	Population	Runway length	Runway width
Antigua	108	70,000	9,000	150
Aruba	70	66,000	8,997	148
Bahamas	4,405	210,000	11,000	150
Curacao	210	156,000	11,187	197
Dominican Republic	18,817	4,836,000	11,000	197

Destination	Area (square miles)	Population	Runway length	Runway width
Guadeloupe	530	327,000	11,499	148
Jamaica	4,411	2,072,000	8,565	150
Martinique	1,100	325,000	10,827	148
Puerto Rico	3,500	3,210,000	10,002	200
St. Lucia	238	120,000	9,000	150
Trinidad	1,980	1,100,000	9,500	150
Venezuela	352,140	12,361,000	11,483	148
Barbados	166	259,000	11,000	150
Grenada	133	120,000	5,250	NA
			9,000	150

¹ New.

Source: Caribbean tourism demand study (1980)—Steinberger.

ANNEX I

It is clear from the examples of Caribbean territories quoted that a definite correlation exists between access to international

flights, direct connections to major markets, and accelerated growth of tourist arrivals to those territories.

All of the islands quoted have had direct connections from international airlines from their major markets, who have the necessary airport facilities to service tourist arrivals adequately.

On the other side of the coin, as detailed below, are the TDD's (touristically disadvantaged destinations)—as they have been designated in volume I of the European Tourism Demand Study "Accessibility: No gateway airports for flights" in the common denominator which identified a TDD. These statements are borne out by the figures quoted hereafter.

Country	Size (square kilometers)	Population	Tourist arrivals 1979	Transportation
Antigua	280	70,000	99,536	"International airport with 9,000 ft runway of sufficient capacity and adequate service quality with international connections."
Aruba	182	66,000	185,141	"Very attractive international airport (9,000 ft runway) with ground-handling facilities and terminal."
Bahamas	11,405	225,000	1,129,430	"International airports in Nassau (11,000 ft runway) and Freeport additionally 25 smaller airports and airstrip air taxi services. Good air connections to U.S., Canada and Europe."
Barbados	430	250,500	370,915	"Large international airport with 11,000 ft runway * * * * * "Direct connections from Europe and North America."
Bonaire	311	9,000	19,696	"Airport expansion * * * * * with construction of extended runway to 2,483 ft for direct access to U.S. markets. Quality and capacity of the facilities are excellent * * * * * N.B. It may be of interest that Bonaire possesses a foot of runway for every member of its population."
Cayman Islands	264	14,000	100,527	"* * * * * airport with 6,000 ft runway. * * * * * new airport in planning."
Curacao	544	158,000	200,000	"International airport with 11,200 ft runway accommodating wide bodied aircraft. Terminal facilities sufficient."
Dominican Republic	48,734	5,000,000	342,578	"Two international airports provide good accessibility to North American market and to Europe via Madrid."
Guadeloupe	1,373	327,000	225,000	"Large international airport with a runway of 11,500 ft suitable for all aircraft with good capacity and standard in terminal for passenger and luggage handling."
Jamaica	11,425	2,000,000	426,540	"Two international airports (Kingston and Montego Bay) and 5 smaller airports provide good air accessibility and facilities."
Martinique	2,849	325,000	159,379	"Large international airport with 11,000 ft runway for all aircraft with full technical navigational equipment. The large terminal meets capacity and quality demands."
Puerto Rico	9,065	3,200,000	1,661,971	"International airport at San Juan with 10,000 ft runway. Seven national airports provide intra-Puerto Rico scheduled service and additionally there are four general aviation airports and eight private airports for taxi services."
St. Kitts/Nevis	262	49,000	25,074	"International airport with runway of 8,200 ft and a new modern terminal building."
St. Lucia	617	120,000	80,000	"International airport with 9,000 ft runway on southern tip and a regional airport north of Castries."
Trinidad and Tobago	5,128	1,100,000	200,000	"International airport in Trinidad with a 9,500 ft runway equipped for wide-bodied aircraft. Smaller airport in Tobago with 6,000 ft runway * * * * *"
Venezuela	912,041	12,300,000	850,000	"International gateway airport with 11,500 ft runway and good connections to South America, North America and Europe. Airport facilities are modern and adequate."
Touristically disadvantaged destination:				
Grenada	345	110,000	29,300	"Regional airport in North-East with a runway of 5,250 ft suitable for smaller planes and day-time operations only."
Dominica	790	77,000	20,111	"Regional carrier has booking, reservations and re-confirmation difficulties."
				"Small airport for regional travel in North-East of island with 4,800 ft runway. Carrier experienced reservation, booking and re-confirmation difficulties."

¹ Estimate.

[Attachment No. 2]

AID CONTRIBUTORS FOR INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

- (1) Cuba, (US) \$33.6 million (material and technical aid).
- (2) Libya, (US) \$4.0 million (cash).
- (3) Syria, (US) \$2.0 million (cash).
- (4) Iraq, (US) \$2.0 million (cash).
- (5) ECGD, (US) \$12.0 million (loan). (Consortium of Export Credit Agencies approved by the British Government.)
- (6) Venezuela, (EC) \$0.4 million (petroleum products, 10,000 barrels of diesel fuel, asphalt).
- (7) Algeria (US) \$6.0 million.

NOTE.—Airport bonds bought in both England and the U.S. by Grenadian nationals, \$108.0 mil. (EC). Airport bond sold locally in Grenada—\$850,000 (EC)

[Attachment No. 3]

PROSPECTUS

The List of Applications will be opened at 10 o'clock on 1st December, 1979 and will remain open until the issue is subscribed or until further notice.

GRENADA GOVERNMENT—INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT

6% Bonds 1999/2000.

Issue of \$10,000,000 U.S. Authorized under the Loan (Development) Act, 1974. Interest

payable on 31st May and 30th November of each year. Price of issue—100 percent.

The Government of Grenada invites applications for Grenada 6% development bonds as indicated above.

Purposes: The proceeds of the loan will be applied for the purposes set out hereunder namely: Schedule, Section 5(1): Construction of International Airport—EC \$30,000,000.

Denominations: The bonds will be of the denominations of \$10, \$50, \$100, \$500, \$10,000, \$25,000, \$50,000 and \$100,000.

Interest: Interest will be payable half-yearly by bearer coupons (attached to the bonds) on 31st May and 30th November of each year.

Coupons will be encashed on presentation at the Treasury, St. George's.

The principal and interest thereon will not be subject to any taxes, duties or levies of the Government of Grenada.

[Attachment No. 4]

AIRPORT AT POINT SALINES

MISCELLANEOUS ESTIMATES OF COST

(Excluding cost of land)

Year and report	Estimated cost
1955—Report on new airport for Grenada and St Vincent by Scott Wilson Kirkpatrick & Partners, consulting engineers: Runway 4,800 ft. long	£600,000
1967—Study paper on airports for Leeward and Windward Islands by Department of Transport, Canada:	
A. Runway, 5,500 ft. runway	Can\$4,940,000
B. Runway, 7,500 ft. runway	Can\$8,741,000
C. Runway, 9,000 ft. runway	Can\$11,042,000
1969—Grenada airport, economic and technical feasibility study by Scott Wilson Kirkpatrick & Partners and the Economist Intelligence Unit:	
1st stage, 5,800 ft.	£4,523,000
2d stage, 7,800 ft.	£4,073,000
Subtotal	£8,596,000
1981—Point Salines International Airport project: EDC Consultancy, SOFRAVIA, Paris	US\$70,988,800

¹ Including cost of land.

[Attachment No. 5A]

STATE DEPARTMENT BRIEFING MATERIALS

U.S. RELATIONS WITH THE EASTERN CARIBBEAN

Our relations with all of the democratic governments of the Eastern Caribbean (EC) are friendly and range from good to excellent. The islands are generally supportive of

our basic interests in the region which include the maintenance of democratic, friendly governments and the denial of influence in the EC to powers hostile to the U.S. We maintain a policy of distancing ourselves from Grenada, the only Marxist-oriented, totalitarian government in the East-ern.

As the islands are gaining independence, the UK is steadily withdrawing from the region. Barbados, the most stable, prosperous and democratic of the mini-states, has repeatedly affirmed its desire to work closely with the U.S. to develop an effective security capability and a regional economic program.

Beginning in December 1979, the Eastern Caribbean witnessed a series of elections which brought to power moderate-to-conservative, pro-U.S. governments. These elections clearly were a rejection of leftist parties embracing closer ties with Cuba and Grenada. They were also a reaffirmation of West Indian support for moderate, pro-U.S. parties reflecting recognition of the increased level of U.S. aid and attention to and support for the region. The principal questions regarding our relations with the Eastern Caribbean are whether this relatively stable political environment will endure and what policy options can most effectively be utilized to ensure continued, if not enhanced, stability in the area.

[Attachment No. 5B]

EASTERN CARIBBEAN: ECONOMIC OVERVIEW

The Eastern Caribbean islands of St. Kitts-Nevis, Anguilla, Antigua, Montserrat, Dominica, St. Lucia and St. Vincent vary in population from 12,000 to 120,000. The largest island (Dominica) has a land area of 750 square kilometers.

The Eastern Caribbean islands differ considerably in their stages of development, but share a common British Commonwealth tradition, and seek to work together in such areas as common government services to minimize inherent smallness of scale difficulties.

Unemployment, approaching 50 percent among young adults in some islands, is a chronic problem throughout the Eastern Caribbean. Private sector production is hampered by small domestic markets, expensive and irregular transport, the emigration of skilled workers, and a paucity of medium-to-long-term financing for new productive enterprises. As a result, insufficient revenue has been generated to fund basic recurrent government services. In some of the islands, infrastructure deficiencies, and the difficulty of maintaining existing infrastructure, are a factor in developing the domestic private sector and attracting foreign investment. Domestic policies in such areas as interest rates, and land tenure have also been important constraints. The perilous state of the islands' economies has fueled political instability.

Fortunately, some of the islands have recently shown some success in attracting non-traditional export industries, in part due to favorable low wages and tax holidays granted by the Eastern Caribbean governments. Their ability to attract further such industries, and to reverse a decade-long decline in agricultural production, is regarded as key to addressing the pressing economic problems of unemployment and a heavy reliance on imported foodstuffs. In addition, the islands do possess considerable tourism potential which might be exploited with greater promotion efforts and better transportation facilities.

Recognizing the serious economic difficulties of the Eastern Caribbean islands, they have recently drawn increased foreign donor focus, particularly by the US, the UK, Canada and the EEC. While this donor activity has helped to buttress the democratically-elected Eastern Caribbean governments, it has just begun to stimulate the private sector, which is vitally needed to generate employment and sustained growth.

[Attachment No. 5D]

U.S. 1980 IMPORTS FROM CARIBBEAN BASIN COUNTRIES

[In millions of dollars]

Country	Total	GSP actual	Dutiable	(¹)	(²)
Netherlands Antilles	\$2,537	\$4	\$2,432	\$4	\$4
Trinidad and Tobago	2,385	4	2,306	2	1
Bahamas	1,373	6	1,323	61	61
Dominican Republic	790	51	397	397	308
Guatemala	431	87	83	64	56
El Salvador	426	19	117	117	98
Honduras	418	63	103	103	90
Jamaica	379	29	35	35	21
Costa Rica	357	56	114	114	75
Panama	330	62	43	28	27
Haiti	253	35	174	174	102
Nicaragua	214	15	102	102	88
Guyana	120	34	8	8	5
Suriname	109	19	0.2	0.2	0.2
Barbados	96	42	52	52	36
Belize	58	33	14	19	9
St. Christopher-Nevis-Anguilla	12	8	4	4	2
British Virgin Islands	10	2	8	7	6
St. Lucia	7	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Turks and Cayman Islands	6	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Antigua	3	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Dominica, Grenada, Saint Vincent, Montserrat	2	0.1	0.5	0.5	0.4
Totals	10,314	570	7,330	1,293	989
Percent of total imports	100.0	5.5	71.1	12.5	9.6

¹ Dutiable excl. petroleum.

² Dutiable excl. petroleum and textiles.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, BUREAU OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS, Washington, DC, April 1980.

(Following are remarks by President Jimmy Carter at a White House reception, to members of the board of trustees of the Caribbean/Central American Action, April 9, 1980.)

We have before us an exciting and extremely important new enterprise. I know you've spent time today discussing what might be accomplished in the future and some of the elements that comprise the circumstances under which we will be working together, not only among ourselves but with literally thousands of other Americans who share our interest in the Caribbean region, including the islands and the countries of Central America.

Tonight marks what I think will be a significant new effort to forge bonds of friendship between the people of the United States of America and our neighbors to the south. Bob Graham has named this group Caribbean/Central American Action, and the emphasis, as you well know, is on the word "action." This is important to us, because what we do will go far beyond good intentions or even good speeches or public statements. We're looking for results, exemplified by lasting friendships both between nations and between people.

This action group represents a coming together of two concerns: first, our shared concern about the vital importance of the entire Caribbean region—that concern and interest has been growing lately—and secondly, a recognition that the friendship on a people-to-people basis must be the foundation for any progress that we envision taking place.

Let me say just a few words about each one of these aspects of our interest. The United States is one of large number of nations and peoples who are washed by the waters of the Caribbean. We are a Caribbean nation just as surely as we are an Atlantic nation or a Pacific nation. Geographically, it's not only the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico, but it's also other States as well; Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas are Caribbean States.

The cultures of our regions enrich one another—language, shared music, a common interest in sports, a common historical background, a common realization of the opportunities for the future. The ties of blood kinship are very strong, and this can be a basis on which we predicate future progress. Members of the same immediate family share citizenship and residence here in our country and citizenship and residence in every other one of the nations in the Caribbean region.

We recognize the extreme strategic importance of the region. This is not of importance only to the United States, but every one of the nations in whom we are interested also must share that common strategic interest and importance. Our security is related one to another.

The waters of the Caribbean touch more than 20 independent nations and more than a half-dozen dependencies. And as you know, the formation of new nations has been an almost explosive and a very exciting event in the last few years, and in the next few years as well. Except for us and Venezuela, Mexico, and Colombia, the other nations are relatively small, but each one is important in its own right.

The economies of this area are quite vulnerable to international or global price structures and actions taken on a multinational basis outside the region. Many of these countries are heavily dependent on one or two or very few commodities. And when the prices for their products are set outside the borders of their own country, there is a tendency to blame all domestic problems on outside forces. This causes people to want to lash out or to distrust outsiders. It creates instability, and it also makes possible the intrusion of alien forces into a country who do not have the best interests of the people as a prime consideration.

The exploitation of dissatisfaction and the desire for change is a recognized fact. These factors have created an open avenue for Cuban adventurism—a Cuba supported by and encouraged by, financed by the Soviet Union. We tend to misunderstand the threat of Cuba. Certainly they contribute to violence and instability in the Caribbean region, but the real threat of Cuba is that they claim to offer a model to be emulated by people who are dissatisfied with their own lot or who are struggling to change things for the better. Cuba's promise, as you well know, is an empty one, just as Cuba's claimed independence is a myth. The inability of Cuban leaders to breathe one critical word of Soviet imperialism, even refraining from criticizing the Soviets' actual invasion of Afghanistan, shows a total absence of independence on the part of Cuba.

As you know, the Soviets prop up Cuba's bankrupt economy with an infusion of several millions of dollars every day. Moreover, Cuba is the only nation on Earth, I believe, that is more dependent on one major commodity now than it was 20 years ago. The stagnation there is debilitating indeed. And we see the hunger of many people on that

island to escape political deprivation of freedom and also economic adversity. Our heart goes out to the almost 10,000 freedom loving Cubans who entered a temporarily opened gate at the Peruvian Embassy just within this week.

We have a concern, yes, about Cuba's threatening role in the Caribbean, but our overriding interest is not to respond to threats of this kind. Our overriding interest must be the well-being, the unselfish relationship between Americans of all kinds and the people who live in that troubled region, but important region.

They're not the only ones who are troubled. Our country, as you well know, shares the same problems, the same troubles of excessive dependence on outside energy, on excessive inflation rates, on relatively high unemployment rates, on a common desire for security, on a struggle to exemplify in our own lives the principles and ideals which we hold so precious. We're not a big brother setting a perfect example in a perfect society for others who are less fortunate than we. We share with our neighbors to the south the same basic problems and also, most importantly, the same basic opportunities.

This is a time when people who suffer under dictatorships of the left and the right want a free voice to express their displeasure and their urging for change, and we are concerned when they're deprived of a right to speak or to act in their own best interest.

Democracy is a vital force in the Caribbean region. We want to encourage that vital force. We've seen tangible evidence in the Caribbean and the South American region of an improvement in the turning toward democracy by many peoples there; in the Dominican Republic, for instance, in the 1976 election—first time in the history of that country when there had been a peaceful change of administration brought about by open and free elections. In Saint Vincent and Saint Kitts/Nevis, the recent elections have also demonstrated that democracy works. In some, there've been temporary setbacks—in Suriname and in Grenada, for instance—but we hope that that interruption will be temporary.

I'd like to say that Central America, as contrasted with the Caribbean, is going through an even more turbulent time right now, when political polarization increases. The advocates of peaceful and democratic change become the targets of both extremes from the right and the left. This is happening in El Salvador. We're deeply concerned about occurrences there. It could happen in other places. The Government of El Salvador is struggling with some very significant reforms in land ownership—one of the most sweeping land reform efforts that I have ever witnessed. And of course we know that this is an effort that both extremes of the right and left would like to see fail.

The challenge to us is to refrain from unwarranted intervention in the internal affairs of any other country, but in a completely proper and open way to help those who want to improve their own lifestyle, their own freedom, and their own economic well-being.

We ourselves are undergoing very rapid change. We're trying to reverse our dependence on imported oil. We are one of the players on the international scene, along with other countries. We're seeking to alter our ideas and develop better relationships with countries in the developing world. Throughout my own Presidency, we have increased our interest in democratic princi-

ples, human rights, and the individuality and the recognition of the importance of each particular country in this troubled region.

Since I was inaugurated, we have more than doubled aid to the Caribbean region. When the Congress completes action on the present aid program, which I think will pass, we will have nearly quadrupled our aid to Central America. And as you all know, this is a time of extraordinary budgetary restraint.

In addition to these bilateral efforts, we have encouraged the formation and worked very closely with 30 other nations and 15 international institutions to provide additional economic help for the Caribbean region—working with the World Bank and others. Multilateral assistance has increased fourfold between 1976 and 1980, from \$110 million to more than \$400 million in that brief period of time.

In short, we have put a high priority on a better aid program for the Caribbean region and for Central America. Our values and our concerns require that we play an active role in this region. We've done a lot as a government. I need not go down any more details, but I would like to say that the relationship between our countries is shaped very slightly by actual, tangible, definite government action.

In many nations of the south, the "U.S. Government" itself is at least partially suspect—likely without good reason, on occasion with reason. And that's what makes it so important for us to expand what the Government can do in a limited way at the Federal level and encompass other elements of American life who can act more definitively and more effectively to magnify the beneficial influence of our great country among the nations and the peoples in the Caribbean region.

The talent, the scientific knowledge, the educational ability, the wealth, the technology of our country is not focused in the Federal Government. It's focused in farmers and workers and businesses and universities, in local governments; it's focused in churches; it's focused among civic groups who have a benevolent character. This is where the real strength of our country lies, and this is an opportunity for tapping the treasure of what the United States is to reach the goals that you are defining in this new entity. That's why we're here today.

I might say that we don't want to supplant the outstanding groups already devoted to similar purposes. We are not going to create a new bureaucracy. We're going to try to coordinate, as best we can, those groups already doing such a wonderful job, build on them, and bring in other thousands of Americans to help us with this common purpose. We're interested in dignity, development, and democracy.

Dignity, to be derived in the hearts and minds of hundreds of thousands of our neighbors who know for a fact, because we are sincere, that we value them, that we want them to have a better life, that we want them to trust us with good reason, not because we have any selfish intent to exploit them as a customer or even as a political ally, but because we know for certain that they and we share common opportunities and common purposes.

Development, not in the form of huge projects perhaps, but community-type interrelationships that can be derived only with a clear understanding of their opportunities and their needs—here again, there is no way to separate the mutuality of benefit to be derived.

And democracy, not trying to foist on others an exact replica of our own government, but to demonstrate by how we act and what we do that our way of life, based on freedom, based on the value of the individual, is worthy of free adoption by others through their own exercise of their own judgment.

Many of you have spent a good part of the day discussing these issues; I know that. But we ought not to forget that everyone here ought to be the core of an enlarging group to encourage diversity of ideas and actions. Each one of you can very quickly think of 10 different organizations or 100 different people that might very well be interested in a particular aspect of people-to-people relationships that would build on friendship, or a business or other relationship that would give us mutually a better life. And I hope that the universities and the churches and the professional groups and others will search diligently for new opportunities for the future.

I happen to be particularly interested in the Friendship Force, because Rosalynn and I organized it while I was Governor of Georgia. We had a sister state in Latin America, and we would send back and forth every year two or three hundred Georgians to live in private homes, and that same state would send two or three hundred of their people to live in the private homes in Georgia. It never got a nickel of any government money, and it provided an exciting new dimension of knowledge of one another. And we've tried to bring that now to the Federal level.

Obviously, there are many other ideas that can be built upon or created. The Partners of the Americas have tremendous experience that can permeate this entire organization, all aspects of what we do, for the better. And of course, the Sister Cities program is another than can be expanded rapidly to encompass the people who live in the Caribbean region. A mission on agriculture is now underway, with Dr. E. T. York heading it up. And I hope that all these groups and many others will make a beneficial impact among our people and to the south.

The last point I want to make is this: We ought always to remember and let our thoughts and our actions exemplify the fact that the benefits to be derived are reciprocal. We're not embarking on this effort to do other people a favor as a handout from a more rich and more powerful neighbor. We should remember that this is a two-way street or a three-way street. We could get many people involved in these kinds of programs. It's a mutual exchange. If we are to speak to others, then we must be equally eager to listen. If we are to teach, we must be equally eager to learn. And if we are to deliver, then we must also be willing to receive, which may perhaps be the most difficult of all.

I've written every one of the heads of state in this region. I've met with several groups here at the White House and over in the Cabinet Room. The response has been very enthusiastic. I think the Caribbean, including us and other nations, are ready for accomplishment of these goals. We want to reach out and make sure that we don't fail.

This is a time when we can let this effort exemplify the finest aspects of American life. And if and when our effort is successful, then it can serve as a pattern, modified considerably or slightly, for the beneficial extension of American hands of warmth and hearts of friendship to other people throughout the world. It's kind of a test

case. With your leadership and your support, with full participation by me when you request and the entire administration here, I have no doubt that we will succeed.

This is not a government program; it is your program. And I hope that each one of you will feel equally as responsible for leadership and for inspiration and for innovation as I myself feel or as your leader, Bob Graham, feels. There is no limit to what we can achieve together, and I stand ready and eager to help in any way possible.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 20, 1981]

**U.S. PRESSES EEC TO REFUSE AID FOR
LEFTIST GRENADA**

(By Karen DeYoung)

The Reagan administration has made a second attempt to persuade the European Economic Community to withhold aid from a Third World country because of U.S. political and strategic concerns.

In an action that has irritated some of the 10 member countries of the Common Market, a U.S. official was sent to the organization's headquarters in Brussels last week to try to head off possible community assistance to Grenada, a small Caribbean island whose government has close ties to Cuba.

Possible differences of view with the Reagan administration on Central American policy were also apparent in a decision announced Tuesday by the Common Market countries to resume aid to El Salvador through the International Red Cross after a month-long break triggered by a U.S. request to shut off supplies that might fall into the hands of guerrillas fighting El Salvador's government.

Asked about the approach to Europe on the issue of Grenada, a U.S. official said that the United States, although not an EEC member, can express its views to the organization on "something which, because of its implications, [involves] more than just economic interests." A number of the European allies, the official said, share the U.S. view, and "we're not the only ones to be concerned."

The official declined to be identified and would not comment on the level at which the diplomatic presentation was made.

U.S. relations with Grenada have been cool since shortly after a group of young leftists ousted the island's longtime autocratic ruler two years ago. The level of bilateral rhetoric has increased over the past year. The United States has charged the government of Prime Minister Maurice Bishop with curtailing civil rights and turning the country into a militarized Cuban pawn. Bishop has accused Washington of trying to destabilize the island through economic warfare and the promotion of counterrevolutionary forces.

Although some EEC members are known to disagree with the U.S. assessment of the situation, others particularly the British, who maintain active involvement among former colonies in the region, have consulted closely with the administration on problems in the Caribbean. But the organization feels that such bilateral concerns should not enter into decisions that, under its own regulations, are strictly economic.

More important, administration efforts to influence EEC decisions are viewed as unseemly attempts at intervention that are likely to create strains across the Atlantic by compromising the Common Market's relation with the Third World.

Last month, in what was described as a virtually unprecedented request casting

doubt on the independence of the Common Market's aid channels, the administration asked the organization to free more than \$1 million in emergency food and medical shipments to El Salvador on grounds that it might fall into the hands of leftist guerrillas there.

The EEC imposed a month-long moratorium on such shipments, but resumed funding for aid to El Salvador after seeing a Red Cross report that indicated the aid would be delivered to the intended recipients.

While there is no war under way in Grenada, a small island northwest of Venezuela, the administration maintains that EEC assistance on an airport construction program would help further what it says are Cuba's "expansionist" aims in the Caribbean basin.

Grenada is a signatory to the Lome Convention, a trade and aid pact that joins the Common Market to 60 Third World countries in Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific. Under the terms of the pact, the EEC guarantees fixed amounts of development assistance to member nations that propose feasible economic development projects.

The Grenadan government has asked for EEC help in completing a new airport, now under construction.

**GRENADA—THREAT TO AMERICA'S CARIBBEAN
OIL ROUTES**

(By Timothy Ashby)

The repudiation of Cuban-style Marxism by Jamaica and other Caribbean mini-states in their 1980 elections has stimulated a reappraisal of this region's strategic importance by American defense and political analysts. Although the general pro-Western political shift has eased State Department fears about a galaxy of Castroite satellites in America's "back yard", Washington should not be lulled into ignoring a Soviet/Cuban bastion of growing importance in the southern Caribbean just ninety miles off the coast of Venezuela. This Cuban-controlled base is the island of Grenada—strategically placed in the heart of one of the richest oil-producing regions in the Western Hemisphere.

CUBAN-BACKED REVOLUTION

Grenada, with a total land area of 120 square miles and a population of 110,000, became independent from Great Britain in 1974. In March 1979, a successful coup d'etat was mounted by thirty members of the New Jewel Movement—a Marxist political party led by Maurice Bishop and Bernard Coard, two native lawyers who held Opposition seats in the Grenadian parliament. Their new regime was named The People's Revolutionary Government.

The revolutionaries had been trained and equipped by the Cuban intelligence agency DCI, and several Cuban operatives took part in the putsch. Within two weeks of the overthrow, Soviet Antonov An-12 transport aircraft had landed three thousand stands of AK-47 rifles, SA-7 Grail surface-to-air missiles and tons of other military equipment to outfit the newly formed People's Revolutionary Army and People's Militia. The PRA and PM were organized along textbook Soviet lines by Cuban military instructors who remained in Grenada following the initial training program, to become permanent officers and NCO's.

In December 1979, a 250-man Cuban construction battalion arrived on the island to begin work on what was publicized as a "new International Airport" to be built at Point Saline, a peninsula on Grenada's south coast. The Cubans were accompanied

by 103 pieces of new Soviet construction and earthmoving equipment, including KRAZ seven-ton trucks, T-100M3 tractors and GAZ-66 mobile command post vehicles—the latter serving as offices at Point Saline.

Under the direction of Soviet and East German engineers, the Cubans constructed a military-style camp on the airport site consisting of 18 Pre-fabricated wooden barracks designed to house forty men each. The "International Airport" has 2,800-meter runways that could be extended to 3,300 meters. After clearing and leveling the "international airport" site, the Cubans directed their efforts towards the construction of a 1,600-meter airstrip some two miles away. Grenada's only surviving newspapers, the Free West Indian and the New Jewel—both owned by the People's Revolutionary Government and seemingly written by propagandists from Granma and Pravda—originally announced that this short airstrip was to be the site of "government housing for the poor." Two weeks later it suddenly became a "new highway to our International Airport" (paralleling the two-lane, dual-carriageway True Blue road some fifty meters away). The latest press releases refer to the nearly completed Cuban construction as "an executive airstrip for government officials and businessmen."

Executive airstrip? The only government or private aircraft permanently based on Grenada are a Cheyenne II loaned to Prime Minister Maurice Bishop by Fidel Castro and a Beechcraft owned by St. George's University Medical School. These are parked at Pearls Airport on Grenada's northeast coast—a perfectly adequate strip for smaller aircraft which has served as Grenada's tourist airport since World War II.

NAVAL BASE

The two airfields are not the only Cuban construction projects. There is also a maritime facility going up along the shores of Egmont Harbour, a deep-water hurricane haven two and a half miles north of Point Saline. Yachting and naval experts consider Egmont Harbour one of the finest protected anchorages in the southern Caribbean. Here, the Cubans have erected six barracks, a machine shop, a large bunker, and a new road connecting the facility to Grenada's coastal highway. A pile-driving barge is at work building a substantial jetty.

Egmont Harbour is surrounded by Caligny Point, the site of Grenada's main military base. The encampment houses some four hundred personnel, including two platoons of Soviet Army "advisers" who are rotated bimonthly from their parent brigade in Cuba. The approaches to Egmont Harbour are commanded by well-camouflaged batteries of 240-mm mortars and quadruple ZU-23 23-mm antiaircraft guns.

STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE

For all of Grenada's minuscule size, it is viewed as an important addition to the Soviet hegemony by Warsaw Pact strategists. Within a five-hundred-mile radius of the island are oilfields and refineries which currently supply 56 percent of the oil consumed on the eastern seaboard of the United States. During the period January to June 1980, U.S. imports of crude oil alone from Latin America and the Caribbean was 6,011,000 b/d (barrels per day). Individual refined oil production figures of countries falling within a five-hundred-mile radius of Grenada are as follows:

Venezuela, 1,013 thousand b/d;
Netherlands Antilles, 588 thousand b/d;

U.S. Virgin Islands, 504 thousand b/d;
Puerto Rico, 786 thousand b/d;
Trinidad, 235 thousand b/d.

In the Netherlands Antilles, the island of Aruba has an Exxon subsidiary refinery which produces 480,000 b/d. Shell operates a refinery at Emmastaad in Curacao with a capacity of 370,000 b/d, which in turn supplies a Shell one million b/d transshipment terminal on the same island. A second terminal with a capacity of 450,000 b/d is operated in Bonaire by Northville Industries and Paktank.

On St. Lucia, one hundred miles north of Grenada, Amerasia Hess has constructed a transshipment terminal with a storage capacity of 15 million barrels; a 250,000 b/d refinery may be added. Hess also operates a 700,000 b/d refinery on St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands, which produces fuel oil chiefly for export to the U.S. east coast.

In 1979, Trinidad imported 141,455 b/d of crude oil for refining and subsequent re-export. The bulk of this crude came from Saudi Arabia (103,840 b/d), all of which was destined for the U.S. market.

In the event of war, this region would be of vital strategic importance to the United States. The destruction of refineries and transshipment terminals coupled with the severing of tanker lanes could cause rapid economic and social chaos in the eastern United States. The Soviets have perceived this for years, along with the fact that their air and naval bases in Cuba, over a thousand miles from Grenada are beyond the range necessary for effective offensive operations in the southeastern Caribbean.

There are currently ten squadrons of Soviet aircraft based in Cuba, including the excellent MiG-27 (NATO designation "Flogger D") and the older Ilyushin II-28 "Beagle" tactical strike aircraft. None of these aircraft have the combat range (600 miles for the MiG-27; 684 miles for the II-28) to allow them to carry out missions against strategic targets in the southern Caribbean from Cuban bases. Even if fuel drop tanks were to be carried, the distance is so great that American and Venezuelan fighters would have ample time to intercept Cuba-based raiders before they could reach their targets.

Grenada provides the perfect solution to this strategic quandary—a mountainous, easily-defended bastion commanding the heart of this rich oil-producing region.

WARTIME HYPOTHESIS

In the event of escalating U.S.-Soviet tensions, which experts on both sides would view as inevitably leading to a military confrontation . . . aircraft could be pre-positioned at Grenada's new "Executive" and "International" airports, both capable of Soviet strike aircraft. This would be in keeping with that facet of current Soviet military strategy which relies on the "Pearl Harbor" principle of simultaneous surprise attacks on key installations to cripple the enemy and cause a scattering of his forces to far-flung defensive positions.

MiG-27's operating from Grenada could strike the totally unprotected refineries in southern Trinidad within ten minutes, based on their operational speeds of 770 to 1,055 miles per hour; the same length of time would be required to destroy the vast Hess oil storage complex in St. Lucia. Similarly, the major Venezuelan oil fields are only seventeen to twenty-five minutes' flying time away, and the essential refineries and storage facilities in the Netherlands Antilles could be reached in about 35 minutes.

Grenada's Egmont Harbour would provide a superb small naval base protected by the nearly encompassing hills from both offshore surveillance and attack. * * *

GRENADA SEEKING CUBAN SYSTEM AND U.S. TOURISTS

(By Barbara Crossette)

ST. GEORGE'S, GRENADA.—The crowd clapped rhythmically and began to sing.

"When the Yankee soldiers come,
When the Yankee soldiers come,
I want to be in the front line,
When the Yankee soldiers come."

Nearly a thousand people had gathered on the waterfront of this island nation's capital to commemorate the death of a local hero. But the occasion rapidly turned into an anti-American rally, reinforcing the belief here that Washington is on the verge of military action against Grenada.

It has been almost three years since a group of young rebels overthrew the government of Sir Eric M. Gairy and began to build a new society, radical in domestic policy and stridently pro-Cuban in foreign affairs.

UNITED STATES WON'T EXCHANGE ENVOYS

Since the coup on March 13, 1979, the United States, under both Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan, has demonstrated its displeasure with events in Grenada by refusing to exchange ambassadors with the Government of Prime Minister Maurice Bishop and his New Jewel Party. The State Department says that when Grenada shows signs of returning to democratic principles, better relations can be discussed.

In public speeches, both Secretary of State Alexander M. Haig, Jr. and Thomas O. Enders, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, have portrayed Grenada as a client of Havana and a bad example to the Caribbean.

Meanwhile, the Government here, while continuing to seek normal relations with Washington, has used Washington's policy of "distancing" itself as a basis for the belief that the Reagan Administration is seeking its overthrow.

Information Minister Don Rojas said in an interview that Grenada "takes very seriously" the threat of invasion, citing American military exercises off Puerto Rico last year as evidence that the attack has already been rehearsed.

AN ARMY OF 1,000

As in Nicaragua, whose revolutionary Government is praised and emulated by the New Jewel Party, the breach with Washington has provided the justification for the creation of a large armed force. According to Government figures, the Grenadian Army has about 1,000 soldiers—similar in size to that of Trinidad and Tobago, which has a population 10 times larger than Grenada's 110,000.

In addition to a regular army, Grenada is also arming a civilian militia that numbers, the Government says, in the tens of thousands. Despite the buildup, however, there is no military presence in Grenada's clean and relaxed capital city. Government offices are unguarded and easily accessible, and no hostility was shown to an American visitor.

Grenadians are urged, in public speeches and in a totally controlled press, to feel "solidarity" with Cuba and Nicaragua. The local Government crafts shop sells a poster of Mr. Bishop shoulder to shoulder with Fidel Castro and Daniel Ortega Saavedra, the Nicaraguan leader.

At the recent rally, Phyllis Coard, head of the island's women's organization, told the crowd that the people of El Salvador were being bombed "on a daily basis" with napalm. She also told the audience that South African troops were "all over" Angola.

Rejecting the idea that the British-style parliamentary system of government did anything for the people of Grenada in the two decades of transition from British rule to independence in 1974 and on through the Gairy years, Mr. Rojas said that the Peoples Revolutionary Government was building "participatory democracy at the grass-roots level" through zonal and parish councils and several Government-sponsored social organizations. There are no plans for elections.

The New Jewel Movement, with its Soviet-style politburo and central committee ruling a one-party state, has closed down all opposition newspapers, allowing only its own paper and another weekly publication it subsidizes and controls to publish. Jewel stands for Joint Endeavor for Welfare, Education and Liberation.

Paradoxically, the Government has expropriated no private companies and plans no action, apart from higher taxation, against the private sector. Several Grenadians in private business told a visitor, however, that they feared that increased tax rates and service charges proposed by the Government to pay for its extensive public spending, such as public corporations in the fisheries industry, tourism and Grenada's new airport, would sooner or later force them to close.

COMMITTED TO A MIXED ECONOMY

Clairemont Kirton, the island's chief economic planner, said that "the Government is committed to a mixed economy."

"No displacement of the private sector is taking place," he said.

Grenada recently hired a New York public relations company to promote American tourism here, where hotels operate at only about 30 percent capacity. It is also building a new airport to handle large jets, a project that has fallen well behind schedule.

The international airport, being built by Cubans, is one of the sources of friction between the island and the State Department in Washington, which sees it as suspiciously large for Grenada's tourist industry and as a potential military base to handle what Secretary of State Haig has termed "every aircraft in the Soviet-Cuban inventory."

While Grenada's leaders insist that they have not completely ruled out elections, there seems little chance, judging from Mr. Bishop's public statements, than any organized opposition will be allowed on the island.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Apr. 12, 1982]

THE LESSON OF GRENADA'S SWING TO MARXISM

(By Lee Martin)

ST. GEORGE'S, GRENADA.—What El Salvador can expect if Marxists win power in that strife-torn nation clearly is seen on this tiny Caribbean island nation that already is being run Cuban style.

Since the March 13, 1979, coup by Prime minister Maurice Bishop and his Havana-oriented regime, the Cuban presence has taken over.

For the most part, the swarms of Cuban workers, technicians and teachers keep a

low profile. Yet a favorite saying here is that Grenada's real government can be found in the Cuban Embassy.

Some of the Cubans are building a new airfield with a 9,500-foot runway—ostensibly for planes packed with tourists. But U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig has said the installation could handle "every aircraft in the Soviet-Cuban inventory."

Other Cubans work on a project so secret that even Grenadians are locked out. Rumors abound that it is to be a submarine base.

The tourist trade once was the backbone of the economy. No longer. North Americans bypass Grenada's famed beaches for other islands.

Even the St. George's University School of Medicine, which enrolls Americans turned down by medical schools at home, may leave.

Grenada, never rich, is poorer than ever, largely because prices for major crops—nutmeg, cocoa, bananas—are unprofitably low.

Calypso dogma. Despite poverty, Grenadians still have a zest for life and music. But calypso now is the voice of revolution. Here's what visitors hear, set to a rhythmic beat—

On majority rule for all peoples: "China for the Chinamen; Syria for the Syrians; Europe for Europeans; righteousness must win."

On Cuba: "People yearning, people learning, about the Cubans in Grenada, about Cubans in Jamaica."

The Bishop government campaigns to convince everyone that the U.S. is about to invade the island. Youths wearing Che Guevara berets chant: "Tell them one sweet Grenada. Tell them one revolution. When the mercenaries come, we go use the AK [Soviet assault rifle] on them."

The U.S. refuses to exchange ambassadors until the government returns to democratic ways. Bishop uses this refusal to justify his military buildup. The Army—1,000 strong—is equivalent to that maintained by next-door Trinidad and Tobago, with a population 10 times larger than Grenada's. A civilian militia is to be armed.

Socialism does not yet dominate the economy. Shops and restaurants are privately run. But British-style democracy, inherited with independence in 1974, has given way to one-party control. Opposition newspapers have been closed down.

The move toward a Marxist society has not wiped out corruption that tainted the earlier government. The new rulers drive expensive cars, and their children attend Grenada's best private school.

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Dec. 1, 1980]

WHERE CASTRO STILL THREATENS IN CARIBBEAN

(By Dennis Mullin)

ST. GEORGE'S, GRENADA.—Despite setbacks for Cuban-style Marxism elsewhere in the Caribbean, Fidel Castro's drive for revolution has forged a solid foothold in Grenada—posing a major challenge for the administration of Ronald Reagan.

Since seizing power in a virtually bloodless coup 20 months ago, Prime Minister Maurice Bishop has parlayed police-state tactics and substantial Cuban assistance into an English-speaking outpost of international socialism in America's back yard.

Castro, thwarted in attempts to plant his brand of Communism in the other fledgling island nations, has thrown down the gaunt-

let to the U.S. in Grenada. He proclaims the coup here "a large revolution in a small country" that could serve as a showcase of socialist development for the Caribbean. Grenada already backs revolutionary opposition groups in Haiti and the opposition party in democratic Barbados and is demanding independence for Puerto Rico.

How Washington responds to Castro's challenge could determine whether the recent election defeat of a Castro-backed administration in Jamaica or the installation of a Castro-backed government in Grenada is the sign of the future in the Caribbean.

Revolutionary fervor has been the rule in Grenada since March 1979, when Bishop's New Jewel Movement toppled the unpopular regime of Sir Eric Gairy. A firm believer in the existence of unidentified flying objects, Gairy had ruled the country since Grenada won its independence from Britain in 1974.

Cuban involvement is apparent everywhere on the island. The first thing visitors see when their turboprop airliners touch down at Grenada's small Pearls Airport is a large billboard offering "revolutionary greetings." A reception hall is adorned with Cuban posters pledging "revolutionary victory."

Throughout this harbor capital are other billboards with revolutionary slogans. A large mural of Cuba's revolutionary hero, Che Guevara, has been painted on a hillside. Large portraits of Fidel Castro, Nicaraguan leaders and Libya's Mu'ammarr Qadhafi decorate the Prime Minister's office, where everyone is referred to as "comrade."

About 350 Cuban engineers are building an international airport south of the city—a project that had been badly needed for years but which many Grenadians believe will be used as a transit stop for Cuban troops en route to join Castro forces in Africa.

A Soviet presence, too. Cuban doctors and technicians have fanned out over the island's 133 square miles. A revolutionary Army is being formed by Cuban advisers. A Soviet fishing trawler lies at anchor in the harbor, while its crew assists the Grenadians in building a fishing industry. Moscow has delivered some new police cars.

Cuba also is helping to expand the radio station so that Grenadian officials can send their message of revolution throughout the Caribbean.

Bishop has made some social improvements. Inexpensive housing-repair loans have been instituted. He has provided schoolchildren with milk produced by state farms converted from 30 estates totaling more than 4,000 acres of land that Gairy had accumulated.

About 200 students are abroad on scholarships, mostly in Cuba, Hungary and other Eastern European countries.

The British-educated Prime Minister also has retained a private economy in a socialist state. Industries have not been nationalized. Foreigners' rights and investments have been protected. Businessmen are working with the regime on various projects.

But despite the gains, Bishop's popularity has been steadily waning since the heady days when a broad parliamentary coalition supported his takeover and pledged to work toward reforms and new elections.

The promised elections have been delayed, alienating many of Bishop's moderate supporters. He explains that he has postponed a vote because the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency might undermine the elections, as he claims it did in Jamaica. Critics contend

that early elections would only lead to the Prime Minister's defeat.

Elections: A luxury? Real reason for the delay, according to a government official: "Elections are a luxury of the petty bourgeoisie. We are moving toward a Cuban-style dictatorship of the proletariat. But that will take time."

Bishop's slide toward Marxism has antagonized many Grenadians. Typical is a comment by one government worker: "I backed the revolution and support the reforms. But I never expected that we would become a full-fledged Communist dictatorship."

Widespread Cuban involvement has angered many residents in this traditionally British-oriented, capitalist nation. "Grenadians have a high sense of propriety and tradition," explains a longtime resident. "They don't understand the need for a revolution and are offended by the changes that the Cubans represent."

Evidence exists that Bishop's New Jewel Movement had been working with Castro's agents long before the coup. Some Grenadians say that a Cuban ship unloaded weapons here just three days after Bishop seized power.

Many islanders now are bracing for what may turn out to be years of Cuban-style government. Newspapers on this English-speaking island are teaching Spanish words. Businessmen tape their own telephone conversations to avoid being framed. Mail is opened.

Opposition is emerging, although at this point it lacks a leader of sufficient stature to challenge Bishop. About 125 political prisoners occupy the imposing Richmond Hill Prison overlooking St. George's picturesque harbor.

Several antigovernment bombings have occurred, including one explosion in June under a podium from which the Prime Minister was speaking. On November 17, five Bishop supporters were killed in two separate attacks by unidentified gunmen. "The people will fight," says a Grenadian. "They're alienated from their government."

But a businessman worries that violent opposition to Bishop's regime will only invite Cuban military intervention. "Something has to give. Grenada is more important to Cuba than Jamaica was. Once they finish the airport, I don't think it will be possible to force the Cubans to leave."

A tighter grip. In the face of challengers to his regime, Bishop is solidifying his hold. More than 1,000 supporters get an hour a day of political indoctrination from Cuban advisers. On militia night each Wednesday, hundreds of other young people are being trained and armed by the government.

The state-controlled press daily calls upon the people to stop "counterrevolutionaries" and to report them to the police. Says one Grenadian: "The government is asking the children to spy on their parents and friends."

All this political turmoil seems out of place on such a beautiful island. Known as the Island of Spice, Grenada still exports nutmeg, high-quality cocoa, mace and bananas.

Tourism vital. The island is such an attraction that in a good year 110,000 people will visit on cruise ships and 32,000 more will stay longer—pumping millions into the economy. About 60 percent of Grenada's hard currency once came from tourism.

Whether that will continue remains uncertain. Hoteliers report that business is off by some 50 percent, as North American

tourists avoid the politically troubled island. The government is trying to stem the loss by sending promotional teams abroad.

But the political climate no longer is conducive to tourism. Reports one Grenadian: "Bishop has canceled elections, closed the free press, brought in the Cubans, and the economy and the repression are getting worse."

Grenada's appeal to North Americans may wane even more as relations with the U.S. continue to deteriorate. Bishop accuses Washington of "back yardism" for allegedly trying to influence Grenada's choice of allies. He also charges that the U.S. has failed to respond to his request for weapons to safeguard his revolution.

What happens on Grenada would go a long way in deciding the outcome of a larger battle going on across the Caribbean, where a generation of young radicals hopes to exploit unrest over slow economic growth, double-digit inflation and 25 percent unemployment.

Supporters of pro-Western governments contend that if the conservative tide that has surfaced recently in Jamaica, St. Vincent, St. Kitts-Nevis, Antigua and Dominica is to continue the U.S. must send more development aid.

Since 1975, U.S. aid had grown slowly, from 35 million dollars to 115 million, in a region where the eastern Caribbean islands alone spend 500 million dollars a year just to import food. "We cannot become complacent and view the Jamaican election as a conclusive victory," says a U.S. diplomat. "It was just a respite. America must take an active role in Caribbean development."

When Christopher Columbus discovered this island in 1498, it was inhabited by cannibalistic Carib Indians. None survived colonial times, when British buccaneers hid from the Spanish Navy in the island's hurricane-free ports. The last 600 Caribs were forced to abandon their way of life and jump to their deaths from a cliff now called Carib's Leap.

Today, Grenadians who oppose the new government fear that if they cannot halt Bishop's Cuban-supported march to socialism, they either will have to leave their island or suffer the same fate as the Carib Indians, who lost their homeland to a foreign ideology.

[From the Chicago Sun Times, Mar. 3, 1982]

GRENADA LOOMS BIG AS SOVIET AIR BASE

WASHINGTON.—A top Pentagon official says leftist-ruled Grenada, a tiny Caribbean Island Nation, "has become an air base available to the Soviet Union."

Fred C. Ikle, undersecretary of defense for policy, made that cryptic remark to the Senate Armed Services Committee in listing what he said were Soviet gains around the world.

Although Ikle did not elaborate in his recent testimony, it was learned that a new, secret U.S. intelligence report quotes Grenada's minister of national mobilization as saying a big new airfield—being built with major Cuban help—would be used by Soviet and Cuban planes.

U.S. intelligence sources said the statement by the government minister, identified only as "Strachan," was the first confirmation that the air base would be used for anything except the tourist trade, which is the way it was advertised when construction started in 1979.

Selwyn Strachan is Grenada's minister of mobilization. The U.S. intelligence report

did not make clear when or where the remarks attributed to him was made.

Grenada is strategically located on the eastern rim of the Caribbean, north of Venezuela.

Although the Reagan administration has concentrated its public statements of concern of what it says are Cuban-backed guerrilla movements in Central America, this administration and the Carter administration have been worried about perceived Cuban efforts to establish footholds among small and impoverished island nations in the Caribbean.

Nearly three years ago, a coup by the leftist "New Jewel Movement," headed by Maurice Bishop, took control of Grenada, which became independent in 1974 after having been a British colony.

Within months of the coup, U.S. intelligence detected the arrival of Cuban military personnel, who were reportedly establishing training and security missions there.

One of the first visible signs of Cuban activity was the start of construction of an airport.

U.S. intelligence has been watching the progress of the airport and now says that it has a completed asphalt runway stretching nearly two miles and is capable of handling Soviet and Cuban troop and cargo transports and other large aircraft.

Supporting the belief that the new airfield is likely to be used by Soviet and Cuban aircraft is a report received by U.S. intelligence that a Soviet air defense system will be installed in the vicinity of that field.

ENTERPRISE ZONE A SUCCESS IN NEW BRITAIN

(Mrs. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, in my home city of New Britain, the State urban enterprise zone program is being credited for bringing \$14 million in investments to the central business district during the past year. This economic development is truly exciting for an area where plant closings and job losses have caused and continue to cause great suffering.

In view of the demonstrated success of New Britain's enterprise zone program, I am dismayed that the House has not acted to pass Federal enterprise zone proposals introduced 3 years ago. Indeed, it is ironic that the advocates of jobs legislation have not devoted themselves with equal energy to pushing enterprise zone legislation. While city officials in New Britain are talking about a "period of unprecedented growth" due to enterprise zone incentives, the House fails to acknowledge the potential of this program and stalls appropriate legislation.

I believe the story of New Britain deserves the attention of my colleagues and should be told around the country. How long must the American people wait for the passage of enterprise zone legislation which, in New Britain, is creating new jobs and helping to revitalize a once distressed city?

In comparison, passage of "jobs bills" is a weak effort with what we know now is comparatively limited impact. I urge my colleagues to support Federal enterprise zone legislation and am submitting an article from the New York Times that presents the success of this program in Connecticut.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 22, 1984]

NEW BRITAIN CITES URBAN-ZONE GAINS

(By Pete Mobilia)

New Britain officials credit the state's Urban Enterprise Zone program with bringing \$14 million in investments to the city's central business district in the last year.

"We really feel we're picking up momentum," said James T. Mahoney, executive director of New Britain's Municipal Action Council, a public-private partnership formed to encourage economic development.

"If you look at this year and last year, and compare it with a couple of years before that, this is really a period of unprecedented growth in the city, and our enterprise zone is a major part of that," he said.

Among the developments cited by Mr. Mahoney are the leasing of two long-vacant major stores in a shopping center, the announcement of a developer's plans to create offices from a 150,000-square-foot factory building and the expansion of a small bakery.

"We put up almost another 2,000 square-feet and were able to purchase up-to-date equipment that we needed," said Frank Napolitano, vice president of the bakery, Red Door Pizzeria, which manufactures frozen pizza products for institutional use. "It was a good opportunity."

New Britain's Urban Enterprise Zone is one of six created by the state's Department of Economic Development in 1982 under terms of a bill passed that year by the legislature. The zones are intended to attract economic development through incentives such as loans, grants, and tax abatements available to companies moving into a zone or expanding within it. The five other zones are in Hartford, Bridgeport, New Haven, New London and Norwalk.

"We're the only enterprise zone in a central business district," said Mayor William J. McNamara. Based on the recommendations of a consultant, officials have emphasized the cultural and recreational benefits of the zone's downtown location in marketing it to prospective developers.

"Besides not only being a good investment, it's a good place to live, work and enjoy yourself," said Mr. Mahoney.

The Municipal Action Council, he said, has also stressed New Britain's site in the center of the state and the zone's easy access to major highways.

The six-lane Route 72 passes through the area now, and the State Department of transportation recently announced plans to incorporate it into the Central Connecticut Expressway, which, when completed by 1989, is to link I-84 in Farmington with I-91 in Cromwell. The expressway is also to incorporate a long unused section of highway adjacent to Route 72 that has become known as the "road to nowhere." When built in 1979, the 1.37-mile-long section of pavement was intended as part of a planned I-291, which was later abandoned by the state in the face of opposition from environmentalists.

Transportation officials say the "road to nowhere" will open in 1986 when other segments of the new expressway are built, link-

ing it to route 175 in Newington and Route 72 in downtown New Britain.

"New Britain is prime for development now because of the highway access," said Mr. Mahoney.

John A. Doig, president of Munro, Jennings & Doig Associates, a real estate development company with offices in Farmington and Vermont, agrees.

"There's an old saw in real estate: There's three things that give real estate value, the first is location, the second is location, and the third is location," Mr. Doig said.

His company announced on March 26 that it had taken an option to purchase the Grove Street plant of the Fafnir Bearing Division of Textron Inc. The plant is to be vacated this year as the manufacturer consolidates its operations in the New Britain area.

"The building is one of the best mills we have walked into," said Mr. Doig. "It would support R and D activities, light assemblage and so forth, which many high-tech firms in particular are demanding in today's market."

Mr. Doig said that he expected to begin a \$7 million renovation on the building within 90 days and that some sections could be ready for occupancy late this year. "It is to our knowledge one of the largest undertakings of first-class office space, whether rehab or not, in an enterprise zone in the state," he said.

Under the enterprise zone program, city officials are allowed to defer for two years 100 percent of the increase in real property assessments that result from renovations. In his case, Mr. Doig estimated those savings at \$150,000 and said his company would be able to charge tenants less than \$10 a square foot because of reduced taxes.

"It gives this project, from an operating standpoint, a tremendous advantage over any similarly constituted property" in this part of the state," he said.

In addition, New Britain recently enacted a three-year personal property tax abatement program.

"We feel this can be a major incentive for facilities that have a lot of personal properties, data processing facilities, high-tech research-and-development-type facilities," said Mr. Mahoney.

The enterprise zone encompasses 320 acres of New Britain's major industrial complex and commercial business district. A bill now before the Legislature would allow the inclusion in New Britain's zone of its last major urban-renewal tract, an adjacent area of about seven acres.

City officials said the only negative comment they had heard from business people about the zone was that some of them think it may be too small. Some businesses in other parts of the city, they say, have expressed interest in obtaining the benefits provided in the zone.

"New Britain has been one of the most aggressive communities in marketing and promoting their enterprise zone," said John J. Carson, the state's Commissioner of Economic Development. "I've been impressed with their efforts."

□ 1850

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE FRANK CHURCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order to the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, my wife, Annette, and I visited the late Senator Frank Church and his wife, Bethine. Frank Church was on the last leg. His body had aged beyond recognition. It was clear that the end was near.

And in a tragic, and moving, and unforgettable meeting, Frank Church spoke not of his own ailment as he was losing his fight against cancer, but he was speaking of his vision of America.

Along with a lot of my colleagues in this body, I would like to take a few moments this evening to remember Frank Church, a Senator for 24 years, a patriot, a scholar, a person of unique intelligence and integrity. He had a distinguished and dedicated record of public service.

He was born in Idaho. He went to school at Stanford and for 24 years served in the U.S. Senate, culminating his public service as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In 1976, he ran for the Presidency and it was my great and distinct pleasure, and honor, and privilege to lead the California delegation pledged to Frank Church to the Democratic National Convention in New York.

Although Frank is principally remembered for his historic contributions in the field of foreign policy, his range of interests covered the broadest possible spectrum. He was a champion of the elderly. He was a fighter for civil rights and human rights. He was one of the most effective spokesmen for our environment, for our wild and scenic rivers, for the nature he loves so much.

He began his adult career as an intelligence officer in the Burma/China/India theater, and it was probably his military experience that made him so profoundly conscious of the importance of fighting for peace.

He was the conscience of the Senate and indeed the conscience of the Congress. And he wrote his own truest epitaph when he spoke on the occasion of the passing of his friend and mine, Bobby Kennedy. I remember well what Frank Church said on that occasion:

Too often men who would win elections tend to be followers, not leaders. They are inclined to go along in order to get along. They are specialists in telling the people what they want to hear. They are animated mirrors, styled to the fashion of the moment, bent to reflect current opinion.

Robert Kennedy, said Frank Church—and I am saying this today of

Frank Church—was "a shining exception to that rule. He was no ordinary garden variety politician. He scorned conformity. He insisted on being himself and he sought to prod the conscience of America."

That basically was Frank's assignment in life, to prod the conscience of the Nation he loved so much.

This Nation and all of us who had the privilege of knowing Frank have been enriched by his presence on this planet. He became chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at the apex of his career.

He should have been President and our Nation would have gained immeasurably by his leadership.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANTOS. I would now yield, if I may, to my friend and distinguished colleague from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. SEIBERLING. I thank the gentleman from California and commend him for taking this time to discuss one of the truly great Americans of our time, certainly one of the greatest Members of Congress in our day.

Other speakers joining in this special order in memory of Frank Church will no doubt recall, as the gentleman from California has, his tremendous contributions in the field of foreign policy, and others will note the great significance and lasting value of his contributions to ending American involvement in the war in Vietnam and instituting greater accountability with regard to the intelligence agencies of the United States. Those were indeed areas where Senator Church made a tremendous contribution to the public interest and to the interests of those very principles on which our Government is based. And I join with others in taking this special order to salute Senator Church for those achievements.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would like for a moment to concentrate on another aspect of Senator Church's career and public life, and that is the area of conservation. Here, too, his contributions were outstanding.

In fact, it would be safe to say that Senator Church never did anything in a small or petty way. He was always an achiever in the greatest sense of the word.

Few of us here today were in Congress in April 1963 when Senator Church was floor manager during Senate consideration of the Wilderness Act of 1964, what ultimately became the Wilderness Act of 1964. But history shows that Senator Church led the charge for Senate passage of the bill and was a key figure in defeating several weakening amendments during Senate debate of this measure.

In more recent times, Senator Church was instrumental in many

other conservation efforts involving resources and values of many parts of the Nation. More particularly, he was a tireless advocate of protection for some of the priceless wilderness areas of his native State of Idaho.

Earlier this year, Congress approved and the President signed legislation, S. 2354, designating the River of No Return Wilderness in Idaho as the "Frank Church—River of No Return Wilderness."

It was my pleasure to be able to call Senator Church when the House acted on that measure and to tell him of it, and he was really quite moved, and I am sure was very grateful at this tribute, a well-deserved tribute indeed it was. Such a special mark of recognition among areas that would have been designated wilderness by that bill was indeed appropriate to Senator Church. He had endeavored to protect those areas much earlier than the year in which it was enacted.

The Wilderness Act of 1964 would have included these in the act as wilderness areas, but they were downgraded in a House-Senate conference from wilderness to wilderness study status, and the opportunity at that time for wilderness designation was lost.

But Frank Church did not rest. Due to complications in the wilderness review process the River of No Return area was not again presented for congressional consideration until the late 1970's when Senator Church introduced new legislation to designate this as a wilderness area.

In the interim, Senator Church had enhanced his reputation as one of the Nation's foremost wildland conservationists by securing enactment of legislation to protect numerous areas nationwide, particularly the spectacular Sawtooth, Hell's Canyon, and Gospel-Hump Wilderness Areas in Idaho. But it was perhaps for central Idaho lands encompassed in the River of No Return Wilderness that Senator Church saved his utmost efforts.

As the Senator said of the area during Senate floor debate on the bill and the conference report, and I do not know whether the gentleman has time for me to read some of those words, but if the gentleman from California has the time, I would just like to read some of his words.

□ 1900

He said:

This superlative region of the Rocky Mountains is what Idahoans mean when they refer to our State as "God's country." For me, and for countless other people, the Salmon River—the famous river of no return—has become a symbol of life. Yesterday is a part of the river which we have already run; it is gone forever. Tomorrow is always unknown, a part of the river which lies around the next bend, obscured by the roar of the next set of rapids, and hidden from sight by the towering cliffs of the

canyon. . . I have always believed that Idaho is big enough to leave some of the public land alone, as a refuge for fish and game, to protect our watersheds, and as sanctuary for those who, from time to time, feel the need to get away from it all. . . .

That, to me is what the battle for the River of No Return Wilderness is really all about. It is a fight to preserve for all time a part of the vanishing American frontier. . . .

As one who has spent many happy days amidst the mountains and streams of this wild region of Idaho, I can think of no finer patrimony for our grandchildren than to leave this region in the same untamed condition in which it was left to us by the Creator.

So Frank Church has passed to his creator, and yet I think his own language perhaps describes this next part of his adventure. And he said:

Yesterday is part of the river which we have already run. It is gone forever. Tomorrow is always unknown. A part of the river which lies around the next bend obscured by the roar of the next set of rapids and hidden from sight by the towering cliffs of the canyon.

Senator Church has gone around that bend, I am sure to further achievements and to further adventures. Frank Church, during his final term in Congress, did just that sort of thing. Undaunted by the fact that his reelection was fast approaching and that a very large wilderness area might cost him a few votes but secure in the knowledge that he was right and that many of the citizens of Idaho as well as people nationwide supported his efforts, Senator Church tirelessly held hearings, negotiations, markups and other meetings to help insure the passage of his wilderness dream and in the end, the Nation was made much wealthier through the preservation of a magnificent 2,239,000-acre wilderness, the largest by far in the lower 40 States.

I would like to say just one other thing, if the gentleman would yield further, and that is that during all this process, Senator Church came to me, even after the bill had passed the Senate and said:

You know, I found that this little community would be affected if we put this particular area in wilderness because there is a saw mill there and I hope you will take action to make an adjustment to help those people.

He was constantly thinking about the welfare of those people even though they may be small in number; whom he had moral obligation to protect and to help and he did that and still managed to preserve this magnificent wilderness for those people and for all others to enjoy.

Let me just say one other thing, if I may.

Mr. Speaker, each generation has its own rendezvous with the land. Senator Frank Church was a leader for over 20 years of a nationwide movement to set aside public lands as natural areas and as wilderness, our country's highest

form of land protection. The establishment of wilderness areas and leaving them in an untrammelled condition for the benefit of generations unborn is truly a measure not only of the man, but also of a civilized and free society.

So, Mr. Speaker, while I certainly join in praising all of the tremendous achievements in Frank Church's great record, I want to be sure that the American people are aware of and remember his special contributions with regard to the preservation of our country's wilderness treasures and I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. LANTOS. I am very grateful to my friend and colleague, who is one of our Nation's leaders in the field of protecting our environment for this very moving tribute to our friend, Frank Church.

You mentioned Idaho many times during the course of your remarks and there is no place that Frank Church loved more and appreciated more than his native Idaho.

He was a native of Boise; he grew up in a Republican household. And he became the magnificent orator by debating his father, arguing with his father after every dinner, on every conceivable issue.

It was fitting that the conservative people of Idaho, a State that is so often viewed as a Republican State, should elect this great Democratic leader as Senator four times. And I was with Frank in Idaho on many an occasion, meeting with his constituents, who told him that while they disagreed with him on many, many things, their admiration for his integrity and for his intelligence and for his patriotism was unbounded.

So I think it is appropriate if I may, Mr. Speaker, if I yield now to my Republican friend and colleague from Idaho to express his tribute to Frank Church.

Mr. CRAIG. I certainly want to thank my colleague from California for setting aside this time to pay tribute to former Senator Frank Church.

I think it is very fitting on this day that we do so.

"The great heart of the world is sad today . . . sad because a great voice has been stilled in death." With those words, mourners bade farewell to one of the most eminent statesmen Idaho ever produced. Forty-four years ago those words were used as the lion of Idaho, Senator William Borah, was laid to rest.

The heart of the world was again saddened—saddened because another great voice from the State of Idaho has been stilled in death. The memory of Senator Church will long endure as has the memory of Senator Borah. And it should because they shared the same aspirations, dreamed many of

the same dreams of greatness for America, and represented their State, Nation, and parties with an honor bestowed on every few who serve in public office.

Although Senator Borah was a Republican, he was Senator Church's boyhood idol. Both men served as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, both men were presidential candidates, and more importantly, both men are recognized as statesmen.

It would be inappropriate for me to extol the political stewardship of Senator Church without recognizing that we held few philosophical beliefs in common. Even so, I, Idaho, and the Nation mourn his passing because he was a man and a leader of deep commitment and a sincere personal resolve to pursue policies he felt were in the best interest of the Nation.

Many Members of Congress will come and go, but few will carve out of their tenures a place in history. Those that do, usually have done so out of their strength of commitment and statesmanship. The passing of Frank Church is the passing of one of those men.

The greatest strength of the American political process is the tolerance, integrity, and intensity of its deliberative process, where men and women of divergent positions seek to implement policies that will steer the country toward a peaceful, prosperous, and free future. Positions on the specific issues at the time define the political participants in that process, but history and force of personal commitment to the process define statesmen. On April 8, 1984, the Nation lost another statesman from Idaho.

Once again, I thank my colleague for the opportunity of remembering Frank Church.

Mr. LANTOS. I want to thank my colleague and friend from Idaho for his very moving tribute to Frank Church.

□ 1910

And I thought it was particularly appropriate that in paying homage to Frank the gentleman mentioned the great Senator Borah of the State of Idaho, because while Frank and Senator Borah did not share all views, they shared the greatness and the love for this Nation. I know that Frank Church had the highest admiration for Senator Borah of Idaho. He talked to me of Senator Borah many times in our discussions and walks.

I think it is the genius of Idaho and it is the genius of the Nation that it produces great Republicans and great Democrats equally committed to the service of our Nation.

I would like to yield at this time to the gentleman from California (Mr. ANDERSON), one of the most distinguished Members of this body, former

Lieutenant Governor of the State of California, a man who has known Frank Church for a long time, who shared his views and philosophy in so many ways, and who would like to say his tribute to the late Senator Church.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from California, TOM LANTOS, for arranging this special order, enabling us to reflect on the life and career of Frank Church, former Senator of Idaho. I was saddened, as all of us were, to hear of the death of this great man 2 weeks ago from cancer.

We are indebted to him for his outspoken words, especially on arms control, the environment, the elderly, and the Vietnam war. During his 24 years in the Senate, Frank left behind an impressive legacy.

Known as the "boy orator" in the Senate, Frank served for 8 years as chairman of the Senate Committee on Aging. In this capacity, he made significant progress in insuring adequate cost-of-living increases for the elderly. In 1975, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence was established under his chairmanship. The committee's final report, which documented numerous improper activities of the FBI and the CIA played an important role in curbing abuses of power by these Agencies. In 1976, he was a candidate for the Presidency.

However, he was to achieve his other major ambition when he became chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1979. Prior to becoming chairman, Frank made a number of major contributions as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. These included his strong backing for the 1963 Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and his floor leadership during ratification of the Panama Canal treaties in 1978. He is most renowned, though, for his early stand against U.S. involvement in the Vietnam war. In 1970, Frank coauthored the Cooper-Church amendment which placed the first limits on expanding the war in Cambodia and Laos. And, in 1972, he pushed for legislation to end all American military activities in Southeast Asia. After leaving the Senate in 1980, Frank continued to speak out on important issues, particularly arms control and world peace.

Frank Church will always be remembered as a fighter. In 1947, he was diagnosed with cancer and given only 6 months to live. However, after shrinking to only 80 pounds, a second doctor disagreed with the terminal diagnosis and prescribed surgery and radiation treatment that led to his almost miraculous recovery.

I join my colleagues in extending condolences to his wife Jean and his two sons, Forrest and Chase. Frank's leadership and companionship will be greatly missed by us all.

Mr. LANTOS. I want to thank my friend from California.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to my good friend and colleague from the State of New York (Mr. GILMAN).

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California, Mr. LANTOS, for coordinating today's special order and giving Congress the opportunity to express its deepest sorrow on the loss of one of its most dedicated and hard-working servants of the people, the Honorable Frank Church of Idaho.

Many of us in the House of Representatives had the distinct privilege of serving and working with Frank Church during his service in the Senate, and had come to admire his sincerity and dedication in pursuing his goals. For 24 years he served the State of Idaho as an outstanding Member of the U.S. Senate and in the last 2 years of his distinguished career he chaired the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Senator Church was an eloquent and independent voice in the Senate for nearly a quarter of a century who pleaded for compassion at home and courageous commonsense abroad. Above all, Frank Church was a moral man, and a man of integrity. His intelligence tempered with his sense of compassion led him to publicly demonstrate his outrage for the gross disproportion between means and ends in American foreign policy. He was convinced that America was strongest when it was true to its most generous and humane instincts.

Truly, Frank Church cared. He brilliantly represented Idaho in the Senate. He was a leading conservationist, an advocate for the elderly, a champion for arms controls, but he went beyond that, for he was a man with a national vision, one that allowed him the flexibility to champion principles which transcend State boundaries.

There can be no doubt that Frank Church left his mark on the country which he so passionately loved. We are today a greater Nation for his efforts and dedication. The Congress and the Nation as a whole will sorely miss the leadership and courage of Frank Church.

Mr. LANTOS. I want to thank my friend from the State of New York for paying his tribute to Frank Church.

Mr. Speaker, we already have on hand scores of tributes from colleagues from across this land, Republicans and Democrats, colleagues from small rural States and from large urban areas, a cross section of America.

As we say farewell to Frank Church, we speak on behalf of a grateful nation.

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my sorrowful voice to those of

the many who mourn the death of Senator Frank Church.

Senator Church succumbed to cancer 37 years after he was first stricken with that dread disease. At that time, he was given only 6 months to live. However, surgery, treatments, and his own indomitable will allowed him to fight off the affliction and live on to devote a life to service to his State and Nation, including 24 years in the Senate. While we mourn his death, we also give thanks that we could benefit from his intellect and leadership.

The qualities of character for which we admire Senator Church are well known: His grace, his civility, his courage and determination, his steadfastness in his convictions. He was a profound thinker, an eloquent orator. And the product of his work in the Senate speaks eloquently for itself and will long be remembered.

He was an early and outspoken critic of this country's policies in Southeast Asia at a time when such criticism, especially in his home State of Idaho, was not at all fashionable. Two pieces of legislation that bear his name—the Cooper-Church and the Case-Church amendments—were instrumental in finally extracting us from our bloody misadventures in Southeast Asia.

We are indebted to Senator Church for the work of the several panels he chaired.

One of his investigations in the early 1970's exposed links between a multinational corporation and the CIA, bribery of foreign officials by corporations and an Arab blacklist of pro-Israel businesses. Another revealed abuses of power by our intelligence agencies, disclosures that led to the creation of our intelligence committees and a closer liaison between the Congress and the agencies.

Senator Church was instrumental in yet another protection of congressional prerogatives. He was cochairman of a committee whose work resulted in legislation that limited a President's power to declare an emergency and exercise extraordinary power independent of the Congress.

As the influential chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Church was in the forefront of the major foreign policy issues of our time; as chairman of the Senate Committee on Aging, he worked industriously to protect the interest of the elderly. Indeed, he was a longtime champion of legislation to protect the civil rights of all Americans.

Senator Church was a true national leader, but he did not neglect the needs and interests of his Idaho constituency. It is most fitting that the Congress earlier this year, in recognition for his determined efforts to protect our environment and natural resources, named 2.2 million acres in

Idaho in his honor: The Frank Church River of No Return.

Mr. Speaker, Senator Church's contributions and accomplishments will be a lasting tribute to his years in service of his nation. I want to join his long list of friends and admirers in expressing my condolences to Mrs. Church and the members of her family.●

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to our former colleague, Senator Frank Church of Idaho.

Senator Church served in the Senate for 24 years and spent much of his time and energy formulating our Nation's foreign policies. He served as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and he was a sensitive and articulate statesman who rendered true service to his State and country. His passing is a loss to us all.●

● Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the late Senator Frank Church of Idaho.

Frank Church had a career of distinction and accomplishment in the U.S. Senate. His was a voice of reason in a number of areas, and he was a particularly eloquent spokesman for the causes of peace and social justice. While perhaps best known for his work in foreign policy and his service on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Church also made important contributions to legislative efforts to safeguard the environment and to protect the rights of the elderly. He was a man of decency and compassion for whom adherence to principle was the standard of a lifetime.

As the chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, Senator Church was the guiding force behind that committee's investigation into the scope and propriety of the activities of our intelligence-gathering agencies. The six-volume report that was issued in 1976 at the conclusion of the committee's inquiry remains a model of balanced and insightful commentary on intelligence functions, and particularly on the usefulness of covert actions. When the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence acted last year to recommend the termination of the covert operation in Nicaragua, the report of the Senate committee provided an important resource. The continued utility of that report is due in large part to the guidance and leadership of Frank Church.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States were well served by Frank Church's career in public life. He left his mark on the Senate and the history of his country, and he will not be forgotten. I want to extend my sympathies to his wife, Bethine, and his family.●

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to join with my col-

leagues today to pay tribute to the memory of a distinguished colleague and devoted public servant—Senator Frank Church.

For 24 years, Senator Church served as a forceful and effective legislator on behalf of his constituents in Idaho. He began his career in the Senate in 1957 after defeating former U.S. Senator Glen Taylor by a mere 170 votes. At age 32, he was the youngest Member of the Senate.

As a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Church took an early stand against excessive American military involvement abroad. In 1963, long before it was popular, he called for an end to U.S. military aid to South Vietnam if its Government continued repressing political opposition. Three years later, he joined 14 of his Democratic colleagues in asking President Johnson to continue his suspension of air strikes against North Vietnam, and in 1970 he coauthored an amendment designed to limit, for the first time, the expansion of the Vietnam war into Cambodia and Laos.

Through his work as chairman of the Senate Energy Research and Development Subcommittee, Senator Church was lauded for his considerable efforts to preserve our Nation's natural beauty. A recipient of the Idaho Conservation Award and numerous accolades from the National Wildlife Federation, the Senator worked to insure passage of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and other significant environmental legislation.

I first met Senator Church when I worked as a page at the Democratic National Convention 20 years ago in Atlantic City. His gracious manner and natural warmth, and that of his wife, left an indelible impression on me. It was readily apparent that he was a humanitarian, a man who fought against injustices in our society, a man who supported social welfare programs and endorsed legislation dealing with fundamental human liberties such as civil rights and equal rights for women.

Senator Church first learned he had cancer while a student at Harvard Law School in 1948. Although doctors predicted he had but 6 months to live, he did not give up. His strong will and courage saw him through a painful series of x-ray treatments and surgery which eventually restored him to health. Almost 30 years later, recalling that period in his life, he said it made him more inclined to take chances that came his way. In many ways, Senator Church took those chances. He stood behind issues which were not always supported by others. He resisted sacrificing his principles and beliefs in the face of strong, sometimes persistent, opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues and citizens around our Nation

in honoring a truly courageous man, a leader of our Nation, Senator Frank Church, and in extending our sympathies to his widow, Bethine, and their two sons. Senator Frank Church has been missed from the Senate and he will now be missed by us all.●

● Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, today we remember Senator Frank Church. Senator Church was well known beyond his native Idaho. He brought a perspective to the Senate which was heard throughout this land. Frank Church had the courage to publicly say that there were limits to America's role in the world. Some of what he said dismayed and angered many Americans. To others it was a word of caution as the Nation plunged into overseas ventures with the certainty that they were good guys and that that was the key to making America prevail over its perceived enemies.

I believe that we can best remember Senator Church's vision by recalling his warning in February 1965. At that time he said:

Head-in-the-sand isolationism died a generation ago. But the pendulum of our foreign policy can swing from one extreme to the other. Once we thought that anything which happened abroad was none of our business; now we evidently think that everything which happens abroad has become our business. In 30 years, an excess of isolationism has been transformed into an excess of interventionism.

Why have we spread ourselves so thin? What compulsion draws us, ever deeper, into the internal affairs of so many countries in Africa and Asia, having so remote a connection with the vital interests of the United States?

The answer, I think, stems from our intensely ideological view of the cold war. We have come to treat Communism, regardless of what form it may take in any given country, as the enemy. We fancy ourselves as guardian of the free world, though most of it is not free, and never has been. We seek to immunize this world against further Communist infection through massive injections of American aid, and, wherever, necessary, through direct American intervention.

Such a vast undertaking has at least two defects. First, it exceeds our national capability. Second, among the newly emerging nations, where the specter of Western imperialism is dreaded more than Communism, such a policy can be self-defeating. As a seasoned, friendly foreign diplomat recently put it: The United States is getting involved in situations where no one—not even a nation of saints—would be welcome.

Senator Church was defeated in his reelection bid in 1980. At that time he was victim of negative commercials. Looking back at his ideas, it is clear that Frank Church left the Senate as a man of principle who has contributed much to the national dialog. His ideas remain as a legacy to all who would seek balance and reason in a complex world that requires more than simple answers.●

● Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, today I join with my fellow colleagues to mourn the recent passing of Senator Frank Church. With his death we

have lost a great statesman, patriot, and more significantly a great man.

For 24 years as a Member of the Senate Frank Church was a presence on our national stage. He spent his long and illustrious career in service to the people of this native Idaho as well as the Nation—always exemplifying the virtues of dedication, wisdom and clarity of purpose.

His efforts in such diverse areas as foreign policy, social justice, and conservation were tireless. Frank Church was a leading and eloquent voice strongly supportive of civil rights protection, expanded benefits for the elderly, equal rights for women and other social service programs. He was also a leading conservationist. It was, however, primarily in the area of foreign affairs that Frank Church made his mark achieving in 1979 the goal of becoming chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

He leaves behind his mark and his vision. We will remember Frank Church for his belief in the worth and dignity of the individual; for his conviction that the United States has a moral mission in the world; and for his leadership in international affairs. As a charismatic leader who sought to translate visions into concrete realities Frank Church's accomplishments will live on as a warm and glowing testimonial to his energy and vision.

To his family I extend my prayers and condolences.●

● Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, Frank Church was a dear and wonderful man, his goodness of a magnitude rare among us.

He was a friend, a champion of issues of foreign policy, personal liberty, and natural resources on which our democracy rests and a man on whose strength we counted. He is so deeply missed by all of us.●

● Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, a vital voice of vision, reason, and integrity was lost to America with the recent passing of Senator Frank Church. A Member of the U.S. Senate for 24 years, Frank Church embodied that all too rare combination of courage, eloquence, and decency. During his service in the Senate and after his departure from that body, Frank Church elevated the quality of both thought and debate in the American political arena.

Perhaps Senator Church's most lasting contribution, and there were many, to his country was his understanding of and commitment to the fundamental American precepts of freedom and justice, and his dedication to applying those precepts to our Nation's policies toward the rest of the world.

Frank Church understood that poverty, injustice, and political repression contain the seeds of their own demise regardless of ideological machinations. He understood that the inexorable

forces of history are best addressed peacefully, and that military force in the face of social upheaval is more often than not destined to fail.

Frank Church understood more deeply than most the words Horace, the immortal poet and philosopher of ancient Rome, "Force without wisdom falls of its own weight."

We should do Senator Frank Church the honor of heeding his words and his wisdom more diligently in his absence than we did when he was with us.●

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise today to acknowledge the death of former Senator Frank Church of Idaho. I would like to take just a few moments to note some important qualities of Senator Church.

During his quarter century of public service in the U.S. Senate, Frank Church stood out not only as a man of ideas, but more importantly, as a man of ideals. He consistently fought for civil rights for all Americans, benefits for the elderly, and equal rights for women. However, above all else, Senator Church stood for a sensible and responsible foreign policy. He continually argued against the disproportion between the means and the ends in American foreign policy, first in the CIA excesses in Chile and Cuba, then in the war in Vietnam, and finally, in the undeclared war in Central America. It seems sad to me that only in death are many of his fears and warnings receiving the recognition they deserved years ago.

Yet, beyond all of these causes rises Frank Church, the individual. The tenacity and dedication he applied to his job gained him respect, if not genuine admiration from Republican and Democratic members alike. It is these qualities we should remember and take to heart, for long after the causes have faded, the ideals of dedication, perseverance, principle, and service Frank Church symbolized will stand as a goal few attain, but many strive for.●

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate this opportunity to join in remembrance of one of our Nation's most competent and compassionate legislators, the late Frank F. Church.

Though perhaps best remembered for speaking out against the war in Vietnam long before it was fashionable and for working to curb the excesses of past U.S. intelligence activities, Senator Church was also a tireless and effective champion of social justice and environmental issues at home.

During his remarkable 24-year tenure in the U.S. Senate, Frank Church demonstrated his courage time and again in taking the lead on issues obscured by controversy. His

leadership and the immense integrity with which he conducted himself earned Senator Church the lasting respect of his colleagues.

This house and, indeed, the Nation as a whole join in paying tribute to Senator Church—a statesman whose wisdom and clarity of purpose will be missed tremendously, but whose example shall forever inspire. We join in extending condolences to his wife Bethine, and their two sons.●

● Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to know Frank Church for more than 30 years—before either one of us came to Congress. From the beginning, there was no question in my mind that this young man would make his mark in American public affairs. In those days, as in later years, he carried a reserve of impeccable civility, but behind that reserve was a warm, compassionate, and witty human being. Decency, independence, principle, and a courageous commitment to justice are the attributes I most closely associate with Senator Church. His eloquence was fueled by conviction and there was always substance in his message. In his private life, he waged a gallant fight against cancer; in his public career, he fought for peace and for policies of moral leadership by our Government in both foreign and domestic affairs.

He pointed out "America's inability to come to terms with revolutionary change in the Third World" but it is important to note that his vision was positive, not negative. Shortly before his untimely death, he wrote that he was looking to the day when the United States would stop "trying to repress the irrepressible" in the Third World and exchange "our unreasonable fear of communism for a rekindled faith in freedom." Frank Church left an indelible imprint for good on U.S. public affairs.

I am proud to have known him, and Bea and I extend our heartfelt sympathies to Beth and his family.●

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we have an opportunity today to honor the late Senator Frank Church of Idaho. I was privileged to know him personally, and he was a truly extraordinary man—a brilliant orator, a talented legislator on a broad range of national and international issues, Presidential candidate, and a man who could relate easily to world statesmen and to all of the people of Idaho who he represented with such distinction from 1957 to 1981.

Frank Church was best known nationally for his role in foreign affairs, his chairmanship of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, his efforts to provide a proper constitutional and legal framework for the work of our intelligence agencies, and for his early and courageous opposition to the Vietnam war. His constituents in Idaho ad-

mired Frank Church for his convictions, even as they sometimes disagreed with him on issues. But he was also a local legislator in the best tradition, defending the interests of his State vigorously in committees and on the Senate floor.

One of the events I remember from my early interest in politics was Frank Church's keynote speech to the 1960 Democratic Convention. It was a remarkable oration, and confirmed that the man who had been the "boy wonder" of the Senate would be a powerful voice in the party for a long time to come.

Following his departure from the Senate, Frank Church was a valued elder statesman in the Democratic Party, and it is unfortunate that we will lack his counsel at this time, when so many of the major foreign policy issues which engaged his interest are before us.●

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleagues, it is with great sorrow that I rise to pay tribute to Frank Church. He showed the same courage and dignity in his death that he brought to his long career as a public servant. His strong character and his skills as an orator were consistently and successfully brought to the struggle for civil rights, the concerns of the aged and the basic needs of his fellow man.

Frank Church was looked upon with great respect, especially in the foreign affairs arena, because he was not afraid to stand up and challenge a decision he felt would adversely affect this Nation. Perhaps his most admirable crusade was his condemnation of our involvement in Southeast Asia. He denounced the executive branch's independent war-time operations and demanded that Congress be given proper jurisdiction over military involvement.

Frank loved this country and was a patriot in the highest sense because he placed the immediate needs of his homeland above any international concern. He demonstrated this through his strong support for social welfare programs. Even as a freshman Senator, Frank was an influential advocate of our social security system. And under President Kennedy he established himself as a supporter of public education, urban renewal, medicare and programs to eradicate poverty. Frank believed in providing all Americans with every opportunity to advance.

I extend my condolences to Frank's family. I know they will miss his companionship, dedication, and leadership, as will we all. But while we mourn the loss of this great Senator who served this Nation for nearly a quarter of this century, we must salute the fine example he set for us all.●

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn earlier this month of the loss of my good friend

and former colleague from Idaho, Senator Frank Church. His untimely death is a loss to all Americans.

Throughout his 24 years of service in the Senate, Frank Church championed the rights of the common person. His leadership in fighting for civil rights, the rights of the elderly, equality for women, and conservation of our natural resources were fights born of wisdom and reason. His courageous stand against this country's presence in Southeast Asia and his efforts to curb abuses by U.S. intelligence agencies, while initially unpopular, proved visionary.

Frank Church's final battle, his toughest, was fought with the same tenacity and clarity of purpose as any of his floor fights. Frank's commitment to improving the quality of life stands as a model to us in these halls as well as in life.

The Congress, the country and I will miss Frank Church's intelligence, compassion and dedication to principles. I offer my condolences to his wife and sons.●

THE CONFLICT IN CYPRUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have called this special order today because I believe that this House must tell Turkey in no uncertain terms that we expect them to help us resolve the conflict on Cyprus.

It has been nearly 10 years since 40,000 Turkish troops invaded and divided that tiny island; 10 years since 200,000 Greek-Cypriots were driven from their homes; 10 years since thousands more were killed and captured by Turkish soldiers who were using American weapons in a manner prohibited by American law.

Today, Cyprus is still divided. Over 200,000 Turkish troops continue to occupy Cyprus, and they have been joined by 50,000 Turkish colonists who were lured from the mainland by the promise of land that had belonged to Greek-Cypriots. The Turkish lire is not the official currency of occupied Cyprus, and the Turkish Government subsidizes over 50 percent of Rauf Denktash's budget.

These unhelpful actions have been taken despite an increasingly generous program of U.S. foreign aid to Turkey. Since our aid embargo was lifted in 1978, we have sent close to \$3.5 billion to Turkey, making that country our third largest aid recipient after Israel and Egypt. Administration officials have estimated that future assistance could top \$1 billion a year for the next 10 years—more than the much-publicized Kissinger Commission requested for the war-torn nations of Central

America. All of this aid has been—and will be—provided under that clearly expressed condition that Turkey would cooperate fully in efforts to bring about a solution on Cyprus.

Last month, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee passed a measure which provides a positive incentive for Turkey to break the deadlock on Cyprus. The bill would provide Turkey with \$716 million in military aid, but the Turkish Government would receive the \$216 million grant portion of that package only if it returns the city of Varosha to the Republic of Cyprus under U.N. auspices. In other words, if Turkey withdraws its forces from Varosha, and makes a concrete contribution to a peace settlement on Cyprus, it will get as much military aid as last year. If not, it will get an amount equal to Greece, and \$255 million below the administration's request.

This condition is a reasonable and attainable test of Turkey's good faith. It does not demand a total withdrawal of occupation forces or a derecognition of the Turkish-Cypriot regime—two conditions that would be consistent with stated U.S. policy. All it asks is for Turkey to carry out a policy it has agreed to many times: In 1978, Turkey suggested that the town would be returned if the arms embargo was lifted. It was, but Famagusta was not. One year later, Turkish-Cypriot leader Denktash signed a 10-point plan with Cypriot President Kyprianou, which included the return of Famagusta. But this also became a dead letter. And this January, Denktash again said he would return Varosha to the United Nation. But nothing has happened.

We cannot wait any longer. The conflict on Cyprus must be resolved. At stake are some basic issues of international law and international morality that have a wider relevance for U.S. foreign policy. At stake are some key strategic interests. At stake is a small country's right to govern itself, free from outside pressures, threat, or blackmail. At stake is the basic belief that American aid should serve American interests and American values.

In sum, America has paid too much to Turkey for too little in return. It is time for Congress to take action.

Today, we have to ask if our taxpayers' dollars have been well spent. I submit that they have not. Turkey is working hard to partition Cyprus permanently and consolidate its control over the northern third of the island.

To get a clear picture of Turkey's designs, we can look back to last November 15 when the Turkish-Cypriots unilaterally declared their part of the island an independent republic. This act, done with the full advice and consent of the Turkish Government, occurred only hours after President Reagan signed a foreign aid bill granting nearly \$1 billion to Turkey. Since then, Denktash has consistently re-

jected U.N. efforts to salvage a settlement with a number of provocative actions. In February, he unfurled a new flag; last month, he called for a constitutional referendum and elections; and just last week, his so-called republic exchanged Ambassadors with the Turkish Government in Ankara. Today, Turkey stands alone in its recognition of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

This Congress, President Reagan, and the international community have all condemned these moves by Denktash and his patrons in Ankara. But this administration's actions have failed to match its tough words. The State Department proposed to increase military aid to Turkey this year, rejecting the legislative mandate to link aid to Turkey to progress on Cyprus.

Clearly, we do have a strategic interest in maintaining good relations with Turkey. But we must not let one-sided support for that country undermine our broader interests in the eastern Mediterranean. Our unquestioning approach to Turkey is fueling a rising tide of anti-Americanism in Greece and Cyprus, and the logjam on Cyprus has strained relations between Athens and Ankara to the breaking point—a development that can only serve to weaken NATO's southern flank.

□ 1920

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. SNOWE), who has been a very consistent and a very reasonable voice of concern for the conflict that rages in Northern Cyprus.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and commend him not only for his statement but also for calling a special order here this evening to call attention to an issue which has been of concern to many of us here in the Congress for some time.

Mr. Speaker, the issue of Cyprus is again before us, as we approach the 10-year anniversary of Turkey's illegal occupation and partition of this independent and sovereign country. Along with many other Members of this body, I am deeply troubled by the continuing injustice and human suffering on Cyprus. In these 10 years a disturbing pattern has developed and, year by year, U.S. interests in the eastern Mediterranean have become increasingly imperiled.

Each year, just as Congress considers foreign aid legislation, there appears a sudden flurry of diplomatic activity; Turkey hints of an impending breakthrough in delicate negotiations. Always, there is the official rumor of an interim agreement over the vacant area of Famagusta and Varosha that would allow the return of its Greek-Cypriot inhabitants. Each year Con-

gress approves increased aid for Turkey—not wanting to prejudice the chances for real progress. Suddenly the negotiations evaporate. Last fall, as Congress considered a continuing resolution containing aid for Turkey, there was talk of a summit between Greek-Cypriot and Turkist-Cypriot leaders and—of course—the return of Varosha and Famagusta. Three days after the legislation passed, Northern Cyprus declared unilateral independence with the support of Turkey.

The latest installment of this tired charade occurred last month. Due to the sincere efforts and hard work of Ed Derwinski our former colleague, and the Secretary General of the United Nations, the Turkish-Cypriot leader, Mr. Denktash, appeared to demonstrate new flexibility. Mr. Denktash talked of restarting the intercommunal talks and delaying the implementation of his unilateral declaration of an independent state on Northern Cyprus. Not surprisingly, the Foreign Affairs Committee was working on foreign aid legislation. Administration officials advised the committee not to cut back Turkish aid, or—if it did—to take the responsibility for upsetting delicate negotiations. Again, there were specific hints of an early return of Varosha.

Soon after the committee accepted increased economic aid for Turkey and improved terms for military aid, Mr. Denktash—upon consultation with Ankara—flatly refused the Secretary General's request that Varosha be returned as a good-will gesture. He then raised an independent flag the first time over Northern Cyprus.

There is no greater threat, ladies and gentlemen, to U.S. interests in the eastern Mediterranean than the present impasse on Cyprus. Turkey's costly occupation and subsidy of its enclave on Cyprus largely negates the effectiveness of U.S. aid, supposedly provided for Turkey's role in NATO. Greece, our other NATO ally in the eastern Mediterranean, increasingly questions our interest in seeking a resolution of the Cyprus conflict and drifts toward neutralism.

As long as the Cyprus issue festers, the dangerous situation in the eastern Mediterranean will only worsen. I am tired of misleading hints of progress offered up for the consumption of Congress, and I am tired of rewarding in advance empty promises. I believe it is time for the United States to begin taking positive action in the search for a solution on Cyprus, and to begin rewarding results. There are issues that still need to be resolved between the Turkish and Greek communities on Cyprus, but the underlying difficulty is the unwillingness of Turkey to alter its occupation force of 18,000 to 25,000 troops. There is still mistrust between the two Cypriot communities, but

Turkey has yet proved unwilling to support a demonstration of good faith even on the easily resolved issue of Varosha.

Awaiting scheduling in the Senate is a foreign aid bill that ties a portion of Turkey's aid to real progress on the issue of Varosha and Famagusta resettlement. There are many other incentives available to Congress. Some may still argue that if Congress were to take even the mild action being considered by the Senate, the sudden promise of some new negotiation might be threatened. Perhaps—somehow—even the imminent return of Varosha and Famagusta would be imperiled. Frankly, I have become numb to such arguments. It is time for this country to seek results, and no longer be diverted from its purpose by the whisper of promises. A lack of a legislative statement at this point will only perpetuate a situation that has gotten worse and has existed for more than a decade; and, if it is not rectified, it could lead to a permanent partition of the island of Cyprus. Frankly that is the most concern that I have about the present U.S. policy toward the problem on Cyprus.

Again I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio for taking the leadership on what is a very important issue to many of us.

□ 1930

Mr. FEIGHAN. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Maine for her presentation which I think is a very accurate portrayal of the efforts that have been made, the failed efforts, over the past several years to reach a solution to the conflict in Northern Cyprus. More importantly, to point out the accuracy of your portrayal of the consequences of failure to reach a solution.

The gentlewoman from Maine, as I said, has been a very consistent and responsible voice on this issue; one that I think the House should listen to very clearly, and I thank the gentlewoman for her participation today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleague from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN) for requesting this special order on Cyprus today. I believe this is a most worthwhile effort, and hope that our words will bring attention to the very serious problems which continue to exist on a long-troubled island.

I first want to state that today's remarks come at a most significant and important time, as we have just witnessed another reversal in the peace negotiations on Cyprus. Exactly 1 week ago yesterday, the nation of Turkey and its puppet government on Northern Cyprus exchanged Ambassadors—an action that has caused growing concern throughout the world and

among many concerned individuals here in America.

In fact, a State Department spokesman was quoted as saying that the exchange of Ambassadors "has caused us deep concern because it could set back United Nations Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar's effort to win a negotiated solution." I, for one, am in complete agreement with this assessment, and would even go a bit further to predict that this action will definitely impede any progress in future attempts at negotiation.

I believe this action by Turkey, the only nation and I repeat and emphasize, the only nation to officially recognize the unilateral declaration of independence by the Turkish-Cypriot community, is a direct rebuke to the requests of the United States and other nations which have sought a reversal to the recognition of this illegal state. It appears that instead of willfully cooperating and working for a united Cyprus, Turkey has added another dimension to the already complex situation which dominates events on Cyprus.

For almost 10 years since the initial invasion of Cyprus by Turkey, I believe we have been patient, but that we have seen little, if any, progress. And to be quite honest, I believe the patience of this Congress and of many Americans has worn thin.

One area where I believe our patience is being stretched to the limit is in the provision of foreign aid and military assistance to Turkey. At a time when we are confronted by large budget deficits, it is difficult to understand why we should continue to indirectly support the Turkish-occupying forces through our financial and military aid programs.

In this regard, relevant committees in both the House and Senate have already taken initial steps to curtail U.S. assistance to Turkey. It is my hope that if progress continues to lag, the full Congress will act and send a clear message to Turkey and the Turkish-Cypriot community that we are tired of waiting and hearing false promises.

In addition, perhaps the time has also come for Congress to consider other measures to address Turkey's actions and the illegal state on Cyprus. Adding new conditions or limitations on U.S. assistance to Turkey is, in my mind, a viable option.

Altogether, I believe the important point is that action is needed now. Now is not the time to wait. Now is not the time for Congress to sit back, and approve full funding for military and economic assistance to Turkey—to act, in effect, as if nothing has happened in the past year.

Something has happened. An illegal state has been declared and Turkey has acted to accommodate the existence of this state. I would ask this Congress how we can possibly ignore

these events and the continuing division of Cyprus. I would ask this Congress how can we pretend that there has been any progress, when, in fact, there have been new impediments constructed to a united Cyprus.

I do not believe we can sit idly by. Action is needed now. Otherwise, I am afraid that Cyprus will remain indefinitely divided, and that Turkey's act of neocolonialism will become a precedent for other nations to follow. In effect, if we do not act, we will be saying to the world that Turkey's actions are acceptable and that the United States will only engage in empty rhetoric.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank my colleague from Florida. I think that the gentleman really has captured the frustration and the impatience that is growing among Members of Congress and the American people generally as we are willing to allow the process, through the Secretary General's office, to proceed; as we are willing to allow the State Department to ask the Congress and the House Foreign Affairs Committee to withhold action as we did just several weeks ago on restraining or conditioning any aid to Turkey until a peaceful settlement could be reached or at least until the process could be underway and then defined as we have displayed that willingness for patience to see the Turkish Government to take the additional step that the gentleman referred to in exchanging Ambassadors with the new self-proclaimed government. One that can only exacerbate the tensions and the problems that exist in Northern Cyprus today.

I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN) for organizing today's special order on Cyprus. Certainly, it has become evident over the last few years that this troubled sector of the globe remains a cause of great concern to all Members of Congress, to our Nation and to many other nations.

Almost 12 years have passed since the Turkish occupation of Cyprus. Since 1974 the Turkish Government has been illegally controlling a large section of Cyprus, and during this period hundreds of thousands of native Cypriots have been forced to flee their homes and villages and thousands of Cypriots have disappeared.

There are many facets to this complex situation, not least among them the humanitarian aspect. Because international security and political interests are motivated as well, it is important that the United States continue to press the Turkish Government

for removal of their troops from Cyprus as an important first step toward settling the issues of Cypriot unification and self-determination.

The other considerations that need to be taken into account include the need to reestablish NATO's superiority on its southern flank. The dispute currently raging between Greece and Turkey must not be allowed to overtake the region, since to do so would be to jeopardize the world's supply of oil. Furthermore, to continue this conflict only enhances the Soviet Union's goals in this region, as they closely monitor every move made by the parties involved.

This special order serves as a vehicle, not only in expressing our congressional concern that this conflict in the Mediterranean be expeditiously resolved, but also in restating our desire that the United Nations continue to probe every avenue for peace and reconciliation in this troubled region.

Just 1 year ago this month, Secretary General of the U.N. Cuellar announced his personal involvement in the Cyprus dispute. The following month, a resolution was adopted in the United Nations which called for the removal of all occupying forces. But the Turkish Government still remains, occupying Cyprus and in fact, responded to this peace initiative by introducing the Turkish lire as the new currency, and arranged for a new "Central Bank" to be set up in the northern part of Cyprus.

Secretary General Cuellar continued his efforts, and in July presented himself again as an arbitrator. While a favorable response was received from the Greek-Cypriots, the Turkish-Cypriots rejected these new initiatives, and called for a summit meeting, which was later contradicted by a rejection.

Mr. Speaker, it has become obvious over the years that the Turkish Government is not serious about resolving this serious conflict. Although still considered a Western ally, it is widely known that Turkey has become the largest recipient of Soviet aid outside the Eastern bloc. This one fact discloses more about the Soviet Union's designs on the region than many volumes of analysis of historical data could ever reveal.

Today's special order is an important reminder to our colleagues of the pressing need which remains in resolving this dispute. Our Nation and the United Nations should redouble all efforts to find a just and lasting peace in Cyprus.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I want to thank my colleague from New York for his statement on this issue this afternoon. He has been a very vocal and a very important voice on the House Foreign Affairs Committee on this issue for several years.

□ 1940

Mr. Speaker, this special order today is one that comes after much discussion with one of our colleagues who has been a very important voice on issues related to American foreign policy in the eastern Mediterranean area. That individual is our colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. YATRON) who unfortunately was not able to join us for the special order, although he has submitted a very important and provocative statement for the RECORD.

I really would like to stress my gratitude and I think the gratitude of the entire House to our colleague, Mr. YATRON, for the strength that he has provided on this issue. I think that no voice in the Congress in recent years has been more reasoned, has been stronger, or has been more effective than that of our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. YATRON) in moving public opinion and in moving the House as well as various administrations to a responsible, reasonable American policy toward a peaceful solution to the conflict in Northern Cyprus.

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague Ed FEIGHAN for requesting this special order on Cyprus, and to commend him for his outstanding leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for stronger action to help end the seething conflict in Cyprus.

On November 15, Turkish Cypriots unilaterally declared a "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus." This illegal declaration, recognized by Turkey and Turkey alone, has seriously aggravated tensions in NATO's southern flank. Turkey's support for the unilateral declaration of independence, and the continued occupation of Cyprus by Turkish troops, are serious obstacles to the improvement of relations among Greece and Turkey, our key NATO allies in southern Europe.

The State Department has rightly condemned the unilateral declaration of independence and Turkey's recognition of it. This Congress has also gone on record condemning this action. But it has become clear that words alone will not persuade Turkey to stop obstructing progress on the Cyprus issue. It seems that Turkey will continue to try to force its will on the Cyprus issue until we make clear that we will not accept a policy of settling disputes by faits accomplis and military action. Turkey's unresponsiveness is particularly galling in light of the fact that the United States has given Turkey almost \$1 billion in aid for fiscal year 1984.

It is time to take tougher action to convince Turkey to take a more responsive and conciliatory attitude toward the Cyprus issue and, by extension, to foster more harmonious relations within NATO's southern flank.

That is why I have joined my good friend and colleague Ed FEIGHAN in co-sponsoring a resolution which would condition further military aid to Turkey on Turkish cooperation on the Cyprus issue.

I would again like to commend my colleague from Ohio for his leadership on this issue, and for arranging this special order on this pressing issue. ●

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman FEIGHAN, for holding this special order on Cyprus. I have the privilege and honor of serving with the gentleman on the Foreign Affairs Committee. In the brief time the gentleman has been a member of the committee, he has gained the respect and admiration of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle for his unwavering commitment and diligent efforts to bring about a just and lasting solution to the Cyprus dispute.

Mr. Speaker, this discussion today is of particular importance given our plans to consider the foreign assistance authorization legislation for fiscal year 1985 on the House floor in the coming weeks. At that time the Congress will be asked to approve an aid package, including almost \$1 billion in military assistance for Turkey.

Over the last few years the Congress has complied with administration policy initiatives with respect to Cyprus. The situation, however, has worsened. Over the last 6 months, Turkish-sponsored actions on Cyprus make it clear that the Turkish Cypriots and their superiors in Ankara do not favor a peaceful solution to this 10-year tragedy. Moreover, the illegal declaration of independence by the Turkish Cypriot community last November and its recent exchange of Ambassadors with Ankara bring Turkey a step closer to realizing its ultimate goal: the annexation of Northern Cyprus.

Mr. Speaker, what I find most frustrating is that no matter what Turkey does in Cyprus, U.S. policy remains unchanged. Turkey becomes more intransigent and we increase our military assistance program. I can only conclude that U.S. policy toward the Eastern Mediterranean is solely concerned with building Turkey's defense and not with resolving the Cyprus conflict. This policy is shortsighted and will only undermine U.S. security interests in the long term.

Given the tensions which now exist between our two allies, Greece and Turkey, the worsening situation on Cyprus could bring both countries to war. If, in fact, this were to occur, NATO would be in complete disarray and the Soviet Union would most certainly seize the initiative to extend its influence in the region.

Mr. Speaker, I support a strong Turkey but its illegal occupation of

Cyprus cannot and should not be accepted by the United States as a fait accompli. It is incumbent on the Congress to reassert its rightful role in the formulation of American foreign policy and pressure Turkey to remove its troops from Cyprus. The stability of the NATO alliance is at stake and the responsibility of the United States as the world leader of human rights and self-determination calls for no less.

● **Mr. MAVROULES.** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN) for inviting me to participate in today's special order concerning the very serious situation in Cyprus. As we here in Congress prepare to consider levels of foreign aid to be given to Turkey, now is indeed an opportune time to carefully review past and present developments in this strategically vital area of NATO's southern flank.

Mr. Speaker, July 20 will mark the 10th anniversary of the Turkish military invasion of Cyprus. On that fateful day in 1974, 40,000 Turkish troops began an operation which would result in the occupation of over one-third of the land area of the Republic of Cyprus.

The Turkish invasion forces gained a virtual stranglehold on the economy of the Cypriot nation. The extent of that control is far reaching; 70 percent of the gross output, 65 percent of the tourist accommodation capacity, 83 percent of the general cargo handling, 56 percent of the mining and quarrying output, 41 percent of the livestock production, 48 percent of the agricultural exports, and 46 percent of the plant production are all in the hands of the intruding Turkish forces.

When we consider that the Greek Cypriots make up over 83 percent of the population compared with less than 17 percent for the Turkish Cypriots, the injustice served on the Republic of Cyprus is even further underscored.

Clearly, the record of Mr. Denktash and the Turkish Cypriots is indefensible. This wrong must be righted.

In the area of human rights violations, the Turks have a similarly indefensible position/record. Since the invasion, over 4,000 Greek Cypriots have been killed—with another 1,600 listed as captured or missing. In addition, 15 American citizens fall under that latter category and remain unaccounted for. I would like to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that for 10 years we have had people suffering. We have had people homeless. We have had people under a regime where they cannot practice their own democracy. How long will the Greek Cypriots be forced to endure these injustices before action is taken to prod Mr. Denktash to move toward alleviating this situation?

In the past, congressional action has created a measure of hope for Cyprus.

An embargo on all arms and military assistance to Turkey was imposed by Congress after the Turkish invasion of 1974. Pressure from the Turkish Government of Mr. Denktash and the Turkish Cypriots led to the first of Denktash's dangling carrots, a promise to discuss the resettlement of over 40,000 Greek Cypriot refugees from the city of Famagusta and its Varosha suburbs. Unfortunately, the Congress took Mr. Denktash's promise on its face value and lifted the embargo in 1978. The result was that discussions never materialized. The carrot was gone.

I must point out that the Turkish sense of timing is no less than uncanny. Last year, 1 day after President Reagan signed an aid package of nearly \$900 million to Turkey, the Turks, with their aid money firmly committed, gave Denktash clearance to declare the formation of his Turkish Cypriot rump state in Northern Cyprus.

This action was clearly an aggressive cohesion—a step of intimidation and confiscation—and morally and legally indefensible. We must not let this clear-cut violation of international law, with its total disregard for any measure of territorial integrity of the sovereign rights of an independent nation, be rewarded by granting another increased aid request for Turkey.

I urge my colleagues to support the levels of foreign aid to Turkey that have received approval from our colleagues in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Only when we agree to grant aid to Turkey contingent upon progress on the Cyprus situation, will we ever see results.

Let us keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, that when we talk about the southern flank for the defense of the NATO alliance, Cyprus and Greece are also a part of that strategic flank. They are America's friends.

We must always remember that the security of the United States in the long run, will hinge upon our adhering to the principles and ideas concerning human rights, justice, and international law. I believe that if we set a precedent and compromise our ideals for the sake of strategic interests, we run the risk of losing respect for these ideals, and weaken the security and threaten the common interest of the free world.

● **Mr. GEKAS.** Mr. Speaker, this evening we are gathered to focus attention directly on the illegal and unilateral declaration of independence by the so-called Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. All too often, unjustified takeovers of countries or territories are accepted by the international community after the passage of time. An immediate cry of protest may be issued, but with time, attention is diverted by other issues, and the origi-

nal misdeeds are forgotten. When a smaller nation is involved, people forget all the sooner.

For these reasons, it is important tonight that we indeed try to focus attention on the attempt by Turkish Cypriots to declare themselves independent of the government which rightfully controls the island of Cyprus. In 1974, Turkish soldiers captured a portion of Cyprus illegally, and for years we have been waiting for them to return the land to the Government of Cyprus. Thousands of Greek Cypriots were uprooted from their homes and forced to flee, and 10 years later they still cannot return. Now, the Turkish Government wants to legitimize their wrongful act by officially recognizing the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. The international community cannot allow this to happen. We cannot let time go by without doing something, so that this unilateral declaration will ultimately be accepted, as wrong as it is, by other nations of world in addition to Turkey.

Although this is my first term in the U.S. Congress, the problem of Cyprus has been on my mind for quite some time now. In 1977, as a Senator in the Pennsylvania Legislature, I introduced a resolution asking the President and Congress to exert their best efforts to resolving the crisis in Cyprus, to restore the 200,000 suffering Cypriot refugees to their homes, and to restore to the people of Cyprus the right of self-determination. The resolution also urged them to give generous American support to the Cypriot refugees. I would never have dreamed then that the terrible situation in Cyprus would have been magnified today by the attempted legitimization of this Turkish Cypriot annexation.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that I am a Greek American, but as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives and a U.S. citizen, I am an American first and always will be. Certainly, I am aware of the importance of Turkey to our NATO alliance. Early in this, my first term in Congress, I was briefed by defense officials as to Turkey's significant role in NATO. However, as an American, I cannot remain quiet as I see actions taken in Northern Cyprus that are highly disruptive to the relations of two NATO allies, and also disruptive to the relations between the United States and those allies. The results are dangerously harmful to the condition of NATO's southern flank.

Also, as an American, I cannot stand by as a NATO country takes part in an exercise totally alien to the values and norms of our democratic society. The recognition of this new nation encourages the Turkish Cypriots to abandon attempts at a negotiated solution to this problem that was caused 10 years ago by an undemocratic land grab. As Americans, we should all be concerned

about these issues and willing to take some positive action to solve them.

The United States must act now to address this situation in Cyprus. Time is of the essence. Therefore, I heartily applaud the action taken by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last month. As many of you know, they voted to grant a portion of our aid to Turkey on the condition that Famagusta/Varosha in Cyprus be returned to the Government of Cyprus under the auspices of the United Nations, to begin immediate resettlement of the Greek Cypriot refugees expelled from the town by Turkish troops in 1974. The Turkish Government has been promising to return the town to its Greek inhabitants for several years without following through, so this committee vote may finally result in some concrete action being taken in this regard. It is my sincere hope that the House will also support similar conditions if the foreign aid bill reaches the floor for consideration.

The placing of conditions on aid to Turkey will hopefully speed up the resolution of this festering international problem, and will then relieve the tensions building up between the NATO allies involved. It is my hope that our efforts tonight will serve to focus a bright spotlight on this problem, and thereby prevent it from continuing into the future, to be accepted with time.

● Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague from Ohio for calling for this special order on the Cyprus issue.

The rush of events in international affairs has swept this crucial issue aside in the past few months.

The situation has not changed. The Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus remains. Its leader, Rauf Denktaş, maintains his intransigent position. And the nation of Turkey, a long-time and trusted NATO ally still recognizes this new state and supports it with the 18,000 to 35,000 troops occupying the island and with funds and with words of encouragement.

Our fundamental belief is also unchanged: Our national interests and the interests of the Cypriot people, would be best served by a bizonal, federal solution. The majority of the people of Cyprus want a unified and independent state.

But the new Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus seems focused more on consolidating power than on working toward a negotiated resolution of the problem. They have written a new constitution, are creating a new flag and a national anthem. Such actions can only make many Cypriots, and many of us here in this House, wonder whether the goal of the new state is unification or partition.

The unilateral declaration of independence by Denktaş and this

faction has been opposed by every nation in the world except Turkey. The United Nations has passed a resolution condemning the action.

The question now facing us, with the U.N.-sponsored negotiations at a delicate stage, is how we can best act to promote the goal of peace. The House Foreign Affairs Committee has taken a first step by maintaining aid to Turkey at last year's levels. Although it is clear Denktaş and his government are becoming increasingly independent of Turkey, the Ankara government still has considerable leverage. We have demonstrated our continued support for a valued friend, but also express our dismay at the recent policies with regard to Cyprus. We can hope that our demonstrations of concern will send a clear message to Turkey. They should understand that if they continue to support this divisive force in Cyprus and do not use their influence to moderate the situation, many of us in Congress will favor firmer action.

Prime Minister Ozal, the recently elected civilian leader in Turkey, is dedicated to democratic principles. In the name of democracy and peace, he should take the necessary action to bring stability to the eastern Mediterranean.

● Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, those in the Congress who value NATO and are dedicated to strengthening all of its elements are deeply troubled by the weakness which plagues the alliance's southern flank. At the heart of that problem is the situation on Cyprus. I therefore approach this special order with mixed emotions. While I am disappointed and frustrated on the one hand, I am also determined and hopeful on the other.

My frustration, of course, flows from more than a decade of Turkey's unwillingness to undo the negative consequences resulting from its invasion of Cyprus. My hope is that this situation can be corrected if a determined effort is made by all parties concerned.

Of this I am certain: Turkey must demonstrate responsible and consistent movement on this issue. Those in the Congress who recognize Turkey's long relationship with the United States and value its contribution to NATO can expect and be satisfied with nothing less.

Ten long years of stalemate is too long. Turkey's unwillingness to take adequate and effective steps to negotiate a solution to the problem is unacceptable. This failure to move merits criticism and will lead to congressional action with respect to U.S. assistance to Turkey. I join in this effort to tell our Turkish allies that our patience is worn thin and that the time for action is now. It is time for the Government of Turkey and its people to recognize that their long-term best interests depend to a large extent on what hap-

pens with respect to Cyprus. That issue can and must be resolved or Turkey's relations with its NATO allies and the United States will suffer. That is not in anybody's interests and only Turkey can prevent this from happening.

● Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague, Mr. FEIGHAN, for setting aside this time to discuss the unacceptable Turkish occupation of Northern Cyprus—incredibly, now in its 10th year. As the tragic events of the last few months prove all too clearly, it is time for the United States to reevaluate its policy toward this country.

The nation of Cyprus has long been marked by turmoil. Under the sway of various governments for centuries, Cyprus finally gained independence from Britain in 1960. Special conditions laid down at the time of independence insured equal representation for the Turkish Cypriots who comprise 18 percent of the population. Further, the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee prohibited intervention by Turkey, Greece, or Britain to change the political balance in Cyprus.

However, in 1974 Turkey violated the treaty when it dispatched 40,000 troops to Cyprus. The Turkish Cypriots laid claim to over 40 percent of the island and set up their own Parliament under the protection of the 20,000 Turkish troops who remain in Northern Cyprus. In addition, they have brought roughly 60,000 Turkish settlers to the northern half of the island. This division has meant the loss of homes and property for tens of thousands of Greek Cypriots.

The Turkish Cypriots have refused to comply with U.N. resolutions calling for the removal of all troops from Cyprus, are unwilling to answer allegations concerning the several thousand Greek Cypriots who disappeared during the occupation, and have impeded progress toward a negotiated settlement.

The tension in Cyprus increased last November when the Turkish Cypriots announced the creation of an independent Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus—recognized only by Turkey. This announcement, timed so as not to endanger the \$700 million in military aid that the United States granted Turkey last year, signals a deterioration in the human rights situation in Northern Cyprus, with members of the Parliament coerced into approving creation of the new state.

Creation of an independent state is an illegal and provocative action which has further polarized the situation, making any negotiated settlement all the more elusive.

While there has been relatively little violence since the announcement of the Turkish Republic, the reinforcement of defensive positions on both

sides of the green line and recent talk of Greek guardsmen being brought to the island are ominous signs.

Because the continuing turmoil in Cyprus poses a direct threat to the stability of the Mediterranean and NATO's southern flank, it is crucial that the United States push for a settlement.

However, the administration's approach to the situation is all carrot and no stick. In a January report to the Congress, President Reagan indicated that he does not have a comprehensive plan to ease the tensions on Cyprus. And, while refusing to recognize the Turkish Republic of Cyprus the administration tried, again this year, to boost military and economic aid to Turkey, seeing this country as an ideal staging ground for a U.S. Rapid Deployment Force.

The administration's focus on Turkey has apparently resulted in a loss of peripheral vision. In its zeal to rearm Turkey, the administration is willing to ignore that country's record of human rights abuses, its problems in paying already outstanding U.S. loans for military equipment and even its continued, illegal occupation of Cyprus.

These actions, viewed by many as tacit approval of the Turkish Cypriots, ignore the history of Cyprus and alienate Greece, our longstanding ally in the region.

Further, unless and until there is a solution to the problems on Cyprus, there is no guarantee of security for U.S. military or economic investments anywhere in the region.

Fortunately, the House Foreign Affairs Committee has taken action to maintain a balance in the Mediterranean by whittling down the administration's request for military aid to Turkey by \$39 million, bringing it back into line with the traditional 7-to-10 ratio and stipulating that both Greece and Turkey support the ongoing talks on Cyprus and agree to withdraw their troops from the island.

The administration should be initiating these actions as a matter of policy. Improved relations between Greece and Turkey are the No. 1 order of business for insuring the security of the region and advancing U.S. policy goals.

Giving Turkey preferential treatment does not forward U.S. policy goals and sets back any chance for improvement of the situation in Cyprus. We should use our aid to persuade the Turks to take a more realistic approach to the issue of Cyprus. We must use our influence to end the illegal occupation and to support the establishment of a constructive independent government on Cyprus.●

● Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague from northeast Ohio for arranging this spe-

cial order to discuss the current situation in Cyprus.

As the situation grows worse on this island country, the role of the United States and of Congress must be to mediate the surmounting tensions between Turkey and Cyprus. A resolution of this longstanding conflict is, indeed, a vital necessity in order to insure the stability of this troubled region of the world. Only through the leverage the United States has over Turkey—through our large military aid program to this country—can we influence Turkey to reevaluate its present occupation of Cyprus and pressure the Turkish Cypriots to moderate their position.

Tensions in Cyprus, which originated 10 years ago with the Turkish invasion of Cyprus, were recently fueled by the recent exchange of Ambassadors between Turkey and the self-proclaimed Turkish Cypriot Government on Cyprus. This ongoing conflict not only harms our strategic interests and investments in the Mediterranean and the Middle East, but also damages our relationship with this island country that has been a dependable friend to the United States.

I could list many examples of this dependability including: the Government of Cyprus granting the United States full access to its facilities when our planes needed to serve the marines stationed in Lebanon; allowing U.S. U-2 overflights of the Middle East and the Soviet Union to originate on its territory; and it remains the only nation in the region to exchange Ambassadors with Israel.

By escalating this year's military aid to Turkey, the administration is walking away from an opportunity to play its hand in an attempt to facilitate a political solution to the Cyprus problem.

Conditioned Turkish aid may not be the only solution to the problems facing Cyprus, however, it is one way to pressure the Turkish Government to realize the importance of a peaceful solution to this growing problem.●

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I eagerly support this special order on Cyprus. Now is the time to do something about the continuing tragedy of Cyprus. Unless real headway is made soon, I believe that Congress will seriously consider cutting military aid to Turkey. Although I regret that such action may be necessary, something must be done now to remedy the current sad situation on that island.

Let us take a look at the facts. As all of you know, Northern Cyprus recently declared itself an independent Turkish-Cypriot Republic. This illegal state is to be separate from the Greek-Cypriot majority of the strategic Mediterranean island. The Turkish-Cypriot Legislative Assembly, meeting in the northern Turkish part of the country, made this shocking and

shameful decision. In recent weeks, the Turkish Government established formal diplomatic relations with the synthetic new country. I am angered and disappointed by the shortsightedness and insensitivity of this illegal action.

As many of my colleagues well remember, Turkey invaded Cyprus in 1974 and occupied part of the island. Thousands of innocent Cypriots were killed in the bloodbath that followed. Many young and innocent Greek-Cypriots are missing. Turkey occupied over 40 percent of the island with over 30,000 combat troops. In recent years, Turkey brought in over 40,000 Anatolian settlers and gave them large areas of Northern Cyprus. Many native Cypriots have been forced from their ancestral villages. Ironically, 78 percent of the population of Cyprus has always been Greek-Cypriot.

Since 1974, the United Nations Special Representative has sought a political solution to the problems of Cyprus. Progress has been essentially nil thanks to the intransigence of the Turkish-Cypriots. Our Government recognizes the Government of the Republic of Cyprus as the only legitimate government of that island. We have called for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Cyprus and have supported a unified Cyprus under one government. We have also undertaken extensive diplomatic efforts with the Turkish Government to persuade them to support our position on this issue.

The recent unilateral declaration of independence and Turkey's decision to exchange Ambassadors with Northern Cyprus only serves to heighten tensions between two key NATO allies. Prolonging difficulties will only undermine America's security interests in the important Mediterranean region. These foolish actions can only lead to further strife, tension, and possible bloodletting.

I believe that the Turkish Government must clearly be told, in no uncertain terms, that what happens on the island of Cyprus does matter to the United States and to NATO. Ankara must soon realize that security assistance to that country can be directly linked to progress on the resolution of the Cyprus issue. Continued delay on the part of Ankara will further harm the NATO alliance and worsen relations between Turkey and the United States. The Turkish Government must realize the urgency of giving this issue their full attention.

I strongly urge my colleagues in the House to support this timely and appropriate special order.●

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to focus the attention of my colleagues on the dismal plight of the Cypriot people as they have struggled for the past 10 years to free their country from Turkish occupying

forces. I commend my colleague from Ohio, Mr. FEIGHAN, for his initiative in calling this special order and in drawing the attention of the Congress to this grave situation. I am pleased to join him today in this worthwhile effort.

Mr. Speaker, as the 10-year anniversary of the violation of Cyprus fast approaches, the Cypriot people are no closer to achieving their goal of a unified and peaceful Cyprus than they were the day Turkish troops landed on Cyprus and forced 170,000 to flee from their homes, causing more casualties, desecrating churches and cemeteries, and completely disregarding the outrage expressed by an astounded international community. Though feeble attempts have been made throughout this past decade to reach a solution acceptable to all the Cypriot people, the intransigence of the Turkish and Turkish Cypriots has impeded any progress. The infrequent resumptions of the intercommunal talks between the Turkish and Greek Cypriots have proven futile and frustrating.

Our own country's best interest in the Mediterranean and the Middle East dictate that we work diligently and tirelessly to seek an effective solution to the conflict that continues to plague the Cypriot people. The intransigence that the Turkish Government has exhibited during this seemingly endless conflict should be condemned by our Government and by all nations that respect the value and sanctity of human life.

Instead of pressuring the Turkish Government to comply with international law and resolve the Cyprus conflict, the administration has chosen to rely on the U.N. Secretary General's attempts and has even proposed an increase in levels of military aid to Turkey. To condemn the Turkish Government on the one hand and to reward the Turkish Government with increased military aid on the other hand is paradoxical and hypocritical. In its foreign aid request, the administration recently proposed an increase in military aid to Turkey and requested \$759 million. Of this total, \$230 million would be provided as a free grant, \$250 million in credits at a concessional rate of 5 percent—well below the prime lending rate in our country—and \$275 million in credits at market rates of interest. The military aid request for Greece and Cyprus, however, was left at last year's levels of \$500 million for Greece and only \$3 million for Cyprus. This aid request not only disrupts the traditional 7-to-10 ratio between Greece and Turkey but also causes grave concern within the Greek Government. This is no way to treat a trustworthy and important ally.

I am gratified that the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee

had the courage to cut the administration's aid request. In the House, the Foreign Affairs Committee trimmed \$40 million from the Turkish aid and brought the grant aid down to \$215 million, reinstating the 7-to-10 ratio. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee went one step further and attached conditions to the \$215 million grant aid. Under the Senate version, the grant aid will not be released to Turkey until the President can certify to Congress that the formerly Greek-Cypriot city of Famagusta/Varosha has been returned to the Government of Cyprus under the auspices of the United Nations for the immediate resettlement of refugees. Both committees increased aid to Cyprus to last year's level of \$15 million. Similar amendments will probably be offered in the House when the foreign aid authorization bill reaches the House floor.

Last November, the Turkish Cypriot leader Rauf Denktash, supported by the Government of Turkey, issued a universal declaration of independence declaring the secession of Turkish occupied Northern Cyprus and effecting a devastating partition of Cyprus. To quell any doubts about the seriousness of Mr. Denktash's declaration and intentions of partition, I would like to inform my colleagues that the Turkish Cypriots have already developed their own flag, and just last week, exchanged Ambassadors with the Government of Turkey. Turkey continues to recognize the Turkish occupied section of Cyprus as a separate state and thus further lessens the chances of a settlement.

For the past decade, we have silently looked on and we have ignored our own strategic interests in not doing all that we could to promote an effective and durable solution to the Cyprus conflict. We have silently looked on as Turkey created a new Berlin Wall dividing north and south and adding a physical barrier to the already existing delicate relations of coexisting Greek and Turkish Cypriots. And we are now not only silently looking on but also rewarding with increased military aid a nation that has condoned the partition of Cyprus.

The actions taken by the House Foreign Affairs and Senate Foreign Relations Committees in cutting aid to Turkey and in imposing conditions on the remaining aid are to be commended. I would urge my colleagues to support these actions and I hope that the aid cuts will be sustained when the aid bill reaches the House and Senate floors.

The situation that currently exists on Cyprus is simply not acceptable. We have the ultimate responsibility for sending a clear signal to the Turkish authorities that we are convinced that the illegal partition of Cyprus is not only contrary to the interests of

the Cypriot people but also to those of the United States. Our country's reputation has been built on our active support for justice and political and religious freedoms throughout the world. In keeping with our traditional support for liberty and freedom, it is our responsibility to actively speak out against this injustice and act to solve this conflict.●

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues in expressing my deep concern about the present situation in Cyprus. It has been almost 10 years since the armed forces of Turkey invaded this small country, occupying nearly 40 percent of the island, and forcing about 200,000 Greek Cypriots to flee south from their homes in the northern part of the island. Yet the Turks still have not been held accountable for their numerous human rights violations and flagrant breaches of international law.

There is extensive documented evidence of gross atrocities and crimes against humanity committed by the Turks during the invasion, and over 1,500 Greek Cypriots are still missing from this conflict. This Turkish action resulted in censorship of the press, imprisonment of innocent individuals, torture, rape, murder, and an immense loss of property and lives.

Most recently, in an attempt to legitimize their barbaric acts, the Turks illegally declared the northern third of Cyprus an independent republic. This action is a culmination of a decade of Turkish aggression on Cyprus, which has been in direct contradiction with established international law, the United Nations Charter, the Charter of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the European Convention on Human Rights.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to stand behind our trusted Greek and Greek Cypriot friends in the NATO alliance, and put pressure on Turkey to reach a resolution to this ongoing conflict. We should immediately utilize all available means to hold Turkey accountable for its illegal actions, to call for the withdrawal of Turkish forces currently occupying Northern Cyprus and for retribution for crimes against the Greek Cypriots.

Almost \$3.5 billion has been sent to Turkey since 1978 in U.S. aid, and it is time for our Nation and this Congress to condition continuing American financial assistance to Turkey on tangible and positive Turkish efforts to achieve a peaceful solution on Cyprus.●

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague Mr. FEIGHAN of Ohio for setting up this special order. The issue of the status of Cyprus is important to the United States for two reasons: First, it involves central questions of international law, and second,

it involves a dispute between two NATO allies.

Resolution of this dispute between the states that comprise NATO's southern flank would enhance our security, and remove a troublesome dilemma from our relations with both Greece and Turkey. Yet, 10 years after the Turkish military intervention in and occupation of Northern Cyprus, prospects for such a settlement seem more distant than ever.

The Turkish occupation of Northern Cyprus continues at this very moment. Despite lengthy U.N. efforts to mediate, the dilemma remains.

One major reason that I am pessimistic about a resolution of the dispute is the unilateral declaration of independence made by the Turkish occupied sector of Cyprus. This act, which is in total violation of the Treaties of Association and Guarantee of 1960, has created new tensions and new barriers to a peaceful resolution of this dispute. I will continue to oppose that act.

I will support U.S. efforts to promote concessions from both sides. But as long as Turkish troops remain on Cyprus I will oppose military assistance to Turkey.●

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, the recent exchange of Ambassadors between the Republic of Turkey and the independent Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus remind us that the Cyprus question will not go away. The situation on Cyprus has serious strategic implications, since both Turkey and Greece are our NATO allies. Surely it is not in America's interest for these two nations to be in conflict. At the same time, the Cyprus situation involves fundamental questions of justice and of self-determination.

Ultimately, we all hope to see a settlement whereby the people of Cyprus can govern themselves, whereby foreign armies are removed, the island reunified, and the rights of all Cypriots are respected. Obviously this is a delicate matter which will involve delicate negotiations. The latest round in this dispute, however, brings into question the good faith of Turkey. Beginning with the declaration of independence, the Turks have signaled us that they prefer theatrics and escalation of tension to serious negotiations. This is not only damaging to Cyprus, but to the NATO alliance, and Turkey has correctly been censured by the world community for its recklessness.

We are all interested in preserving good relations with Turkey, Mr. Speaker, and we should support the effort to revive democratic institutions in that country. But if we are to maintain good relations, we must put pressure on Turkey to refrain from jockeying for position on Cyprus. It is counterproductive; it will only lead to further tension, and that will make de-

mocracy harder to achieve, both in Turkey and on Cyprus.●

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN) for giving Members this opportunity to speak on this important issue today.

We are now approaching the 10th anniversary of the Cyprus conflict and we have as yet seen no hope of a resolution in the near future. In fact, due to recent actions by the Turkish Cypriots declaring an independent Turkish Cypriot Federated State and exchanging ambassadors with Turkey, we are now perhaps further from a resolution than we were only 5 months ago.

There is no doubt that the United States has vital security interests in Turkey, but Turkey alone does not constitute the strength of the southern flank of NATO. If the problems on Cyprus are left to fester, relations between Greece and Turkey will continue to deteriorate and United States and NATO security interests will be further weakened. The effectiveness of NATO is severely undermined by the tension between Greece and Turkey, and that tension is profoundly exacerbated by the feud between these two nations over Turkey's intervention and continued occupation of 40 percent of Cyprus. The threat of regional war, which almost broke out after the invasion, has not been eliminated.

The United States must make it clear to Turkey that it is not in Turkey's interest to continue its intransigence on this issue. While the argument that it is in the U.S. national interest to assist in upgrading Turkey's defenses is a valid one, this must be considered in concert with the fact that Turkey spends roughly \$200 million annually to support the 25,000 Turkish troops on Cyprus. In addition, 40 percent of the Turkish Cypriots' budget is underwritten by the almost bankrupt Turkish economy. Pressure must be placed on the Turks to insure that U.S. assistance is utilized as it was intended—to help strengthen Turkey's participation in NATO—rather than to pay for the continuation of the Turkish occupation of Northern Cyprus.

In addition to the security aspect of the conflict, the tragedy of the 1,600 disappeared—including 8 American citizens—continues. For 10 years, the Turks have refused to provide any information on any of these cases, despite hundreds of petitions presented by family members.

The United States is rightfully concerned about American security interests and a strong Turkey; however, should this concern supercede the importance of our relations with both Greece and Cyprus, we will all be the losers. U.S. assistance to Turkey is vital, but without cooperation from Turkey to end this decade-long dispute, our efforts to protect the south-

ern flank of NATO will be wasted. Absent a just resolution of the conflict on Cyprus, there will be no peace in the eastern Mediterranean and no security for NATO.

Steps by Turkey to remove its troops from the island, to provide an accounting of the disappeared, and to agree to the return and resettlement of Farmagusta, would certainly go a long way toward lessening the tensions in the region and in diffusing the opposition to aid to Turkey in the Congress. The ball is in Turkey's court, as it has been for the past decade. We must make it clear that Turkey is out of "time-outs."●

● Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, the division of Cyprus is an issue of continuing importance to the United States and thus I am pleased that so many of our colleagues have joined today in addressing the tragic history of that island. It is especially timely in light of recent Turkish and Turkish Cypriot actions which can only aggravate tensions in the eastern Mediterranean.

As we all know, Mr. Speaker, the Republic of Turkey exchanged envoys last week with the self-proclaimed Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, sending an ambassador to the island to present his credentials. Clearly, this ill-conceived action can only undermine efforts to promote national reconciliation between the two communities on Cyprus.

U.S. policy since the early 1960's has been aimed at preserving an autonomous, united and sovereign Cypriot Republic as mandated by the treaties of 1960 under which Cyprus gained its independence. This policy was severely tested by the Turkish invasion of Cyprus in the early 1970's. At that time, the United States imposed an arms embargo on Turkey.

Since the Turkish invasion, successive administrations, cooperating with the United Nations, have sought to mediate the dispute and to bring about the removal of Turkish forces from the island. They have done so because of our traditional support for a unified Cyprus, and because they have recognized that the continuing division of the island only exacerbates tensions between Greece and Turkey, both important American allies and members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. In order to facilitate efforts at mediation, Congress agreed to lift the arms embargo against Turkey at the request of President Carter. We were told that lifting the embargo would encourage Turkey to be more forthcoming in the continuing effort to negotiate a solution.

Despite our efforts to promote a solution, Turkish and Turkish Cypriot actions since last November offer little hope that they are committed to a united Cyprus. Actions such as we have seen in the last week damage the

prospects for unification in two ways. First, in the short-term, the exchange of envoys implies an increased Turkish commitment to Turkish Cypriot sovereignty, which is clearly incompatible with national reconciliation and a unified Cypriot Republic. Second, in the long term, Turkish and Turkish Cypriot actions since last November have further polarized the Cypriot community and heightened tensions between Greece and Turkey.

While this most recent move may have been intended to confront Greece and the Greek Cypriots with a fait accompli, thereby solidifying the Turkish Cypriot negotiating position, the practical effect has been to undermine efforts to achieve a negotiated solution. Indeed, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, has indicated that he deeply regrets these developments, which have placed current U.N. negotiating efforts in jeopardy.

The Turkish decision to recognize the so-called Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus is in direct violation of Security Council Resolution 541, and the talks between Mr. Perez de Cuellar and Rauf Denktash, the leader of the Turkish Cypriots, would appear to be stalemated. As a result, we seem no closer to a resolution of this issue today than we were a decade ago.

Clearly, the continuing lack of progress can only cast a pall over the relationship between Turkey and the United States. The sending of a Turkish Ambassador to Nicosia completely ignores the expression of congressional sentiment contained in House Concurrent Resolution 220, which condemned the unilateral declaration of independence by the Turkish Cypriots last November. And it was made in spite of the fact that the United States has substantially increased aid to Turkey since President Reagan assumed office. In fiscal year 1985, for example, the President is requesting \$934 million in economic and military aid for Turkey, more than twice the funding level when the Reagan administration took office.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, recent Turkish and Turkish Cypriot actions have damaged the prospects for national reconciliation, jeopardized U.N. efforts to resolve the conflict, and threaten to further damage good relations between Turkey and the United States. I am deeply troubled by these developments, and I sincerely hope that some moderation in the Turkish and Turkish Cypriot position will be forthcoming.

Until we see a more forthcoming position, I would have to oppose the ever higher levels of assistance to Turkey that President Reagan is recommending.

● Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, we continue to hear about the situation on Cyprus from many people on all sides

of the issues involved there, but one thing that remains as true today as it was 10 years ago is that the situation is not getting any better. There have been numerous talks under the auspices of the United Nations and there have been many missions from the United States. The result of all of these efforts at mediation has been a blatant attempt at permanent partition by the Government of Turkey.

Last fall, the day after President Reagan signed a foreign aid package to Turkey, the Turkish Cypriots declared their portion of the island an independent nation. They were able to get away with this secession because of the presence of 20,000 Turkish Army troops on Cyprus. This latest insult to the international effort to restore Cyprus as an independent and unified nation was a coldly calculated act that must not go unrecognized by our Nation. The fact that the newspapers of Greece and Cyprus carried the news of the secession right above the story about our \$1 billion aid to Turkey had to have been planned by the Turks for maximum negative effect on our vital relations with Greece.

I am the first to acknowledge that Turkey is an important part of NATO. As such, Turkey needs to be helped and supported in its ability to resist any military or political moves by the Soviet Union. However, the strategic value of a nation does not replace its obligation to live by moral principles and to halt aggression upon and occupation of another nation's territory. Turkey refuses, despite all efforts of the world's diplomats, to withdraw from its occupation of Cyprus.

Mr. Speaker, I am disheartened by the actions of the Government of Turkey. I do not believe that the United States should deal with the continuing crisis in Cyprus in separation from its other dealings with Turkey. I shall do all that I can to see that Cyprus is reunified and returned to its former status as an independent nation which rules its own destiny and its own people.

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about the situation on Cyprus. Ten years ago Turkish troops occupied the northern one-third of the island; 200,000 Greek Cypriots were uprooted from their homes, and our two allies in NATO were thrust into a deep enmity. In November 1983, a virtual independent state was declared by the Turkish Cypriots, and last month, after Turkish gunboats fired near Greek vessels, Greece recalled its ambassador from Turkey and put its armed forces on alert. And still, 20,000 Turkish troops occupy Northern Cyprus. The tragic situation seems to be worsening.

At a time when our country's strategic interests are clearly being threatened in the Middle East and Persian

Gulf, Turkey with its need to defend its eastern borders with Syria, Iraq, Iran, and the Soviet Union, is distracted by its continuing feud with Greece to the West. Greece, on the other hand, has threatened to withdraw from NATO over our apparent indifference to the situation. Both countries are vital to secure NATO's southeastern flank. It is clear that finding a quick and equitable solution to the situation in Cyprus is crucial to American interests.

I commend my colleague, Mr. Feighan, for his efforts in allowing us this opportunity to reaffirm the commitment of the Congress toward finding a peaceful settlement for Cyprus. We must restate our determination to work for the freedom of all of Cyprus. In the past, Congress has endorsed rewarding cooperation and punishing intransigence in finding a peaceful solution to the matter. The International Security Assistance Act of 1978 which specified that "any future aid requests for Turkey be analyzed in terms of the steps Turkey has taken to facilitate a Cyprus settlement, with emphasis on removal of Turkish troops from Cyprus and the return of refugees to their homes." The linking of U.S. military aid to Turkey's assurance of continuing to seek settlement may be the best way of securing freedom for Cyprus. Yet, since 1978, and especially in the past 2 years, military aid to Turkey has increased substantially. Indirectly, this aid is allowing Turkey to continue to keep its troops on Cyprus. It is time to carefully review our aid program in this light, and to make Turkish assurance of active cooperation in seeking a just settlement to the Cyprus problem a precondition for continuing further military aid.

I urge my colleagues to take note of the continuing suffering of Cypriots, the danger to NATO security, and the growing demand of the American people for a peaceful and speedy resolution to the stalemate on Cyprus. Freedom on Cyprus can only come with the removal of all foreign troops. When considering further military aid to Turkey, I urge you to also consider the impact that guarantees made for that aid can have on resolving this crisis.

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, Congress deservedly devotes a good deal of time toward Middle Eastern affairs, yet events concerning Cyprus are often overlooked. Thus I am pleased to join my colleagues in a discussion of the current situation on Cyprus.

It has been a decade since Turkish troops invaded and partitioned Cyprus. Unfortunately, the island remains divided and there has been no decrease in tension; Turkish troops remain in northern Cyprus. Last year Turkish-Cypriot leaders illegally declared the creation of an independent

state in Northern Cyprus, and this month the Turkish Government exchanged ambassadors with the so-called Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. While Turkey stands alone in its recognition of this "state," it is urgent that a negotiated solution is reached before this illegal partition becomes permanent.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that our Government make all possible attempts to assist the Government of the Republic of Cyprus in attempting to resolve the island's problems. It is in our strategic interest to see that this conflict, one that also involves Greece and Turkey, is ended and NATO's southern flank strengthened. Also, it is appropriate that we come to the aid of one of our most dependable allies in the Middle East. We need only look back to recent times to see what a dependable ally Cyprus has been. When the United States needed a base from which it could serve our marines in Lebanon, Cyprus was more than willing to grant us full access to its facilities. The Cypriot people have been staunch friends of the United States.

In November we passed House Concurrent Resolution 220, in which this House condemned the UDI. My comments at that time provide an important message:

While talks on the reunification of Cyprus have been proceeding slowly, they have continued. Optimism has been particularly high since the accession of a democratically-elected government in Turkey last month. However, the Turkish-Cypriot community has now taken an unnecessary action which may lead to the permanent division of Cyprus into two hostile states. We must condemn this attempt to secede from the Republic of Cyprus: it destroys the country's territorial integrity and unity and it serves to make permanent the disruptions caused by the 1974 occupation of Cyprus, in which thousands of people were displaced and others remain unaccounted for.

We must remember this situation as we consider this year's foreign aid bill, which includes large sums for Turkey. We have an interest in supporting Turkey as a vital part of NATO and an ally. However, we must also remember that the Turkish Government is the key to the resolution of the continuing standoff on Cyprus. The President of Cyprus, Mr. Kyprianou, has recently come forth with a comprehensive plan to resolve the conflict. Likewise, U.N. Secretary General Perez de Cuellar has been working for months to bring about a resumption of negotiations on the future of Cyprus. However, this willingness must be matched by the Turkish Cypriots if real progress is to be made. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is the area in which the United States can be of assistance. We must find ways to spur all sides to sit down and negotiate an end to this prolonged and unfortunate crisis.●

● Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in today's special order concerning the situation in Cyprus.

In 1974 Turkish military forces invaded the independent nation of Cyprus. This action, which was condemned by both the United Nations and the United States, initiated what has become a serious threat to peace in the eastern Mediterranean region.

For 10 years now, international bodies have repeatedly condemned this occupation and have called for the immediate disengagement of the military presence in Cyprus, and for 10 years the Government of Turkey has ignored these demands. On November 15, 1983, the Turkish occupation of nearly one-third the entire island was solidified by the illegal declaration of the region as an "independent" state.

Yet, despite its undeniable involvement in this act, Turkey continues to be the third largest recipient of U.S. military aid. I am well aware that Turkey plays a vital role as an ally in a critical area of the world. I am also aware that expressing support of this nation by reauthorizing current levels of military aid implicitly condones Turkey's violations of international law and pursuit of a policy of aggression against another dependable U.S. ally.

When the House Foreign Affairs Committee considered President Reagan's request for continued military aid to Turkey, I reluctantly supported a compromise agreement allowing that aid to move forward because of signs of progress toward negotiations. However, a number of us on the committee intend to seriously reexamine that decision when the foreign aid bill reaches the floor in several weeks, and will base our final determination on military aid for Turkey on specific progress toward a solution to the Cyprus problem. I urge my colleagues to join me in monitoring very closely developments in this regard, and to consider what concrete steps have been taken for peace before any military aid to Turkey is approved.●

● Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been a decade now since Turkish troops landed on Cyprus and the island was effectively divided in two. It has been 21 years since intercommunal fighting broke out and the first steps toward partition began. One might say that this is a problem that is now coming of age.

Last November 15, the leadership of the Turkish-Cypriot community issued what it called a declaration of independence in an attempt to secede from the Republic of Cyprus. Apart from the Government in Ankara, no government has recognized this secession. In fact, it has been condemned almost universally. I am happy to see that the Reagan administration has made

known its displeasure, as has the United Nations.

The solution to the wrenching problems of divided Cyprus will not be found in yet deeper division. The islanders share one small island; that is a fact that all the secessionist declarations in the world cannot alter.

I would hope that the Congress would go on record as supporting the territorial integrity of Cyprus and opposing its bifurcation.

Vocal declarations of support for the central Government—the internationally recognized Government—of Cyprus are important for another reason as well. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I would like to highlight this other reason for Members who may not be aware of it. During the deployment of our marines in Lebanon, the Government of Cyprus went out of its way to be helpful. It made available to our Armed Forces the airport at Larnaca, without which we could not have so easily moved mail, medicines and supplies to our task force off Beirut. Throughout the world, many countries—including nations allied to us by treaty—refused to help. Now, many of us were unhappy with the administration's Lebanon policy. But I think it is very important to remember that despite the controversy of that policy domestically and abroad, the Government of Cyprus was willing to brave criticism and help us to reduce the cost and complexity of that deployment. Governments willing to be of such assistance should not lightly be pushed aside or ignored when they ask for our assistance.

Right now, the assistance that the Government of Cyprus requests is very modest. It simply wants our support for the principle of a united Cyprus. We should give that support mainly because it is the right thing to do, because a policy of partition is no solution for the travails that bedevil that island. And we should give that support enthusiastically, loudly, and unstintingly because Cyprus stood by us when it was not always the popular thing to do. If we are to expect other small countries to stand by us in the future, they must know they can expect our unswerving support when they are right.

Mr. Speaker, I will not pretend to outline a constitutional resolution for the problems of Cyprus. That is not for me or for the American Government to do. A settlement in Cyprus must be worked out by the communities that live on Cyprus, not by us or any other outside powers. But the hopes for settlement are not enhanced by secessionist declarations. The hopes for settlement can be improved as the nations of the world, and the United States, make abundantly clear that we

are not about to accept that secession.●

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, 10 years have passed since the army of the Republic of Turkey invaded the sovereign Republic of Cyprus on the pretext that they were protecting the rights of their Turkish minority compatriots. The dimensions of this so-called protection of Turkish minority rights have been continually expanded since that tragic day. Just recently Turkey exchanged Ambassadors with the political entity they forcibly created on the territory of the Republic of Cyprus.

Can we in good conscience stand by while Turkey uses the military assistance we provided for offensive purposes when they are only supposed to use our assistance for defensive purpose? Can we stand by while Turkey expels the inhabitants of Cyprus, wipes out every trace of their history and culture, and de facto incorporates this land into itself with the importation of thousands of colonists? I think that we cannot.

As the major supplier of arms and technical support for the Turkish military we share responsibility for their actions. We must take positive steps to end this blatant aggression or end our assistance to Turkey. That is why I strongly support House Resolution 4505, a bill that would terminate our assistance program to Turkey unless action is taken to revoke the illegal declaration of independence of the rump Turkish state of Cyprus. As I wrote in testimony before the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East:

The only legal and responsible course to take in this situation is to insist that the military assistance we provide be used for defensive purposes only, and not in support of blatant aggression. This principle must be the cornerstone of our policy.

The continuing partition of Cyprus is a personal tragedy for many of my constituents whose own families have suffered exile from their homes and the destruction of their historic and religious sites on Cyprus. It seems unmistakably clear to me that the Turkish Government by its recent establishment of diplomatic relations with its puppet republic has no intention of respecting the integrity of Cyprus and is unlikely to do so unless we take stern action to remind them that it is not our policy to reward military invasions and occupations with out military and economic assistance.●

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an issue that is of vital importance to U.S. interests and to international peace as a whole: the situation in Cyprus.

Since 1974, Turkish troops have illegally occupied a portion of the sovereign nation of Cyprus. Regardless of U.S. and U.N. efforts, Turkey has shown little indication of willingness

to withdraw from the island. Considering the circumstances, the United States must send a strong and clear message to the Government of Turkey that meaningful negotiations must begin immediately.

In an effort to provide adequate pressure, I believe the United States must inform Turkey that future aid will specifically depend on Turkey's willingness to begin negotiating a peaceful resolution to the Cyprus problems. Aid should be conditioned on the resumption of U.N. negotiations and progress in settling the conflict based on democratic principles of majority rule with full minority rights. In addition, it should be stressed that all Turkish military forces in excess of those permitted by the 1959 Treaty of Alliance should be withdrawn from Cyprus and necessary steps taken to reverse the declaration of an independent state in Northern Cyprus.

While these steps are justifiable solely on the basis of human and civil rights for the people of Cyprus, it is also important to remember that Cyprus is of significant strategic importance to the Western nations. It is part of the southeastern flank of NATO, and there are two British bases and a U.S. radar base on the island. These bases provide important assistance to NATO and Western interests in the area, including the operation of surveillance flights and over the horizon monitoring of Soviet nuclear launches.

Considering the gravity of the circumstances, the United States must strongly express its dissatisfaction over the current situation. It is my hope that by specific and emphatic action, we can convince the Turkish Government to reconsider its precipitous and unwise actions.●

● Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, the stability and security of our southern flank in Europe is being undermined by the tension between two of our important allies—Greece and Turkey. One of the most serious problems contributing to this tension is the conflict regarding Cyprus. A mutually, satisfactory reconciliation of differences regarding Cyprus could resolve this problem.

Unfortunately, last November Rauf Denktaş exacerbated the problem by declaring a separate and independent Turkish-Cypriot state. This declaration was uniformly condemned by the world community because it sought to foster secession from the recognized Republic of Cyprus and to destroy its territorial integrity and unity. President Reagan condemned the declaration and called for its nonrecognition and reversal. Both Houses of Congress, also, condemned the declaration and called for its nonrecognition and reversal. In Resolution 541, the Security Council of the United Nations de-

plored the declaration as a "legally invalid" act and called for its nonrecognition and reversal. The European Community, the Council of Europe and the European Parliament condemned it as well.

One country stood alone in support of this declaration—Turkey. In addition, Turkey continues to subsidize the Turkish-Cypriot community and maintains thousands of troops over 37 percent of the island, which protects this declaration. Without this support the Turkish Cypriots would be forced to work for a political reunification of their country with the Greek Cypriots.

The United States can play a role in resolving this problem which affects our own security. Through our foreign assistance to Turkey, we can send a clear message to Turkey that they must begin to work for a resolution of this question as opposed to supporting a division between these two communities.

Therefore, when the House considers the foreign assistance bill, I will work for such a clear message.●

NEW ERA FOR ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CORCORAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

● Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing the New Economic Recovery Act of 1984 today to usher in a new era of economic growth. We can credit our country's surprisingly rapid economic recovery to reduced inflation and the impact of the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981, both results of the leadership of President Reagan. President Reagan took a lesson from the books of President Kennedy, reducing taxes and stimulating saving, consumption, and investment—all essentials of a healthy economy.

The new era bill is geared toward business investment and growth. It would amend the Internal Revenue Code to reduce all levels of corporate income tax rates, collapsing the five existing rate categories into three. Section 11(b) of the Internal Revenue Code currently taxes corporate income at rates of: 46 percent for income in excess of \$100,000; 40 percent for income between \$75,001 and \$100,000; 30 percent between \$50,001 and \$75,000; 18 percent between \$25,001 and \$50,000; and 15 percent for income not in excess of \$25,000. My bill would tax corporate income at rates of: 36 percent for income in excess of \$100,000; 24 percent for income between \$50,001 and \$100,000; and 12 percent for income not in excess of \$50,000.

In addition to simplifying taxes, an advantage in and of itself, new era would promote the private sector

growth necessary to the creation of jobs and reduction of unemployment. When we reduce the tax on corporate income, we free up capital for investment, modernization, research and development, hiring—in short, for economic prosperity.

A most popular misconception exists that corporations do not share equally the tax burdens of America. Abysmal corporate profits explain all too well reduced corporate tax revenues of recent years. The decline in corporate tax receipts as a proportion of total Federal tax receipts reflects the long-term reduction of corporate profits as a share of our national income and the incredible growth of payroll tax burdens on employers and workers. In less than 25 years, payroll tax receipts have increased from 18 percent of total receipts to over 33 percent.

That businesses have not been able to absorb the disastrous effects of three recessions in just 8 years is evident from a study of key indicators of corporate financial strength. According to the New York Stock Exchange Office of Economic Research, corporate profits were down to 6.6 percent in the first three quarters of 1982, from an average of almost 10 percent in the seventies and almost 13 percent in the 1964 to 1969 period, reflecting a steady and sharp decline. Short-term debt is up, requiring constant repayment or debt rollover, and the interest coverage ratio—the ratio of interest liabilities to corporate profits—reach all time lows in 1980, 1981, and again in the first three quarters of 1982. This means that interest payments relative to corporate profits have greatly increased, placing a strain on businesses' ability to finance debt obligations. In short, corporations are more in debt with less ability to handle that debt. Debt-equity ratios have also deteriorated, making it difficult to find additional financing. The sorry state of corporate finances is most painfully reflected in the levels of business failure in 1981 and 1982, the highest rates in half a century.

There are many sources for this financial strain—the recessions, burgeoning Federal budget growth and accompanying crowding out of private investment, tax biases toward debt financing, inflation and deflation, high and volatile interest rates—you name it. The solutions are more difficult to locate, but a key element must be to ease the pressure toward debt by returning money to the businesses. This will improve cash-flow, alleviate the need for borrowing, reduce the pressure of continuing high interest rates, and increase ability to finance existing debt.

In the short term, a reduction in corporate tax rates will doubtless lead to some revenue loss to the Treasury, but the long-term increase in economic growth will provide a more stable and

profitable source of revenue growth than does a policy that continues to encourage business failure, with attendant job and revenue losses.

Some of my colleagues point to the deficit and cry out for tax increases, a foolhardy step just as our economy is beginning to revive. Such increases would, in the short run, raise revenues, but in the long run we would choke our fledgling recovery and set into motion another cycle of economic devastation.

I hope my colleagues will consider the evidence of the past and stay with the course President Reagan set for us in 1981, a course of private sector recovery combined with spending control—a course that we know works. My bill follows this path, and I urge my colleagues to support my bill and a new era of growth.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of our colleagues, I would like to include in the RECORD at this point the text of the bill I am introducing today.

H.R. 5506

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the rates of income tax on corporations

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "New Economic Recovery Act of 1984".

SEC. 2. RATES OF INCOME TAX IMPOSED ON CORPORATIONS REDUCED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 11 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to amount of income tax imposed on corporations) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) AMOUNT OF TAX.—The amount of tax imposed by subsection (a) shall be the sum of—

"(1) 12 percent of so much of the taxable income as does not exceed \$50,000;

"(2) 24 percent of so much of the taxable income as exceeds \$50,000 but does not exceed \$100,000; plus

"(3) 36 percent of so much of the taxable income as exceeds \$100,000."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1983.●

PRO-AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE) is recognized for 30 minutes.

● Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to the work of an organization that deserves recognition for its many contributions to the preservation of the principles upon which our Nation was founded.

The organization to which I refer is Pro-America, a nonpartisan organization of women volunteers founded in 1933 by Mrs. Theodore Roosevelt. Organized to support the principles of the Constitution and its traditional

ideals and values, Pro-America accomplishes this by:

First, combating all destructive influences which would imperil the sacred heritage of liberty bequeathed the Nation by its Founding Fathers.

Second, establishing educational programs.

Third, supporting legislation which is consistent with the intent of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Fourth, participating in the election process through the identification and support of truly qualified candidates.

Fifth, giving input to the executive branch and the U.S. Congress on issues of concern to the membership of Pro-America.

Sixth, addressing State legislators and local officials on issues of concern to the members of Pro-America.

The organization has developed Pro-America resolutions which constitute its policies. Hours of study and deliberation go into the writing of these resolutions, and every effort is made to formulate ones which will stand the test of time.

Following are a few of the many principles Pro-America seeks to preserve. These resolutions were adopted at the Pro-America national board meeting in 1983.

Pro-America believes that as an immediate strategic objective, the U.S. Government should use its space technology to accomplish the following:

Reverse the adverse trends in the strategic weapons balance;

Replace the failed strategy of mutual assured destruction with a strategy of assured survival and peace through strength;

Provide both protection and incentive for U.S. industry to tap the enormous industrial potentials of space; and

Adopt the high frontier concept which fulfills these objectives.

The National Association of Pro America:

Opposes a nuclear freeze and continues to advocate a buildup of all areas of defense to convince the Soviets that they could not win a war against the United States.

Recognizes the involvement of the Soviet Union in terrorist activities throughout the world as well as the role of the Soviets as instigator/motivator behind so-called peace groups, and deplores any action by U.S. citizens which lends credibility to such activities as detrimental to the national security of the United States.

Seeks to educate the general public by publicizing the subversive actions of the Soviet Union, Soviet agents and other misguided individuals in order to preserve the security of the United States and its citizens.

Demands that our Government, as a first step toward world peace, end "most favored nation" status, cancel

all loan guarantees, cut off further credit, rigidly enforce the espionage laws to prevent theft or smuggling, and bring an immediate end to this suicidal and treasonous transfer of technology and technical expertise to the world's largest arms producer and threat to peace, the Soviet Union and all other Communist nations.

Supports all efforts to oppose and expose the Soviet active measures, especially in the nuclear freeze movement.

Supports the liberty amendment.

Opposes the equal rights amendment.

Urges the administration to honor the Taiwan Relations Act.

Supports complete suspension of funding for the Asian Development Bank if Taiwan is ousted.

Opposes abortion.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend Pro-America for its dedication and perseverance in upholding the ideals our Founding Fathers advanced. I would personally like to thank all those involved with Pro-America for their unending support and ability to keep the faith in the face of great adversity. These individuals, who have given so freely of their time, should be saluted for their hard work and enthusiasm. I wish them success in continuing this vital service, guided by the traditional values promulgated by our Founding Fathers.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent yesterday for roll-call No. 91, which was final passage of S. 373, the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984. I am a supporter of this bill, which in its present form is the product of both of the committees on which I serve, the Committee on Science and Technology and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I would like the record to reflect that if I had been present I would have voted "Aye."●

FREEDOM AND DEFENSE OF THIS COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, many times we hear a lot of unnecessary rhetoric on this floor, and I do not like to participate in that. However, there are two areas in which I feel a great deal of concern and those areas are the subjects of my special order tonight. One is freedom and the other is the defense of this country and the immediate threat to our

security and freedom by problems that originate very close to our borders.

Mr. Speaker, I was recently watching "ABC World News Tonight" and heard a very interesting account of the Vietnamese boat people, who continue to try to escape Communist tyranny by the sea. The newsman on this show, Peter Jennings, remarked about how horrible the Thai pirates are: Of the 138 boats which reached Thailand, 77 had been attacked by Thai pirates. Since 1981 more than 500 refugees, mostly young women, have been abducted by the pirates, most all were raped and then either thrown overboard to drown or sold into prostitution. The U.S. Committee on Refugees says something must be done to help the Government of Thailand's efforts to stop piracy or it will never end. I agree.

Equally horrendous, however, are the atrocities perpetrated on the Vietnamese by the Communists who have taken over the country.

I believe these barbarous acts are clearly described by Nuygen Vu, who is a very young man who escaped to freedom from Vietnam. Nuygen Vu was one of those boat people. Three years ago his family was one of the lucky ones that made it to the United States and ended up in College Park, GA. Nuygen Vu is now in the fifth grade. I would like to read to my colleagues the essay he wrote and read before the Georgia Association of Educators, and I quote:

Sometimes I wake up in the middle of the night and wonder whether I'm in Vietnam or in America. I can't believe that I'm in an American school with wonderful teachers and friends—have I forgotten everything? I store it in my heart day after day. That's the suffering I experienced during my early childhood. When I was four, just like other children, I had a family, we had a happy life, but one day something happened to us. It was like a mean storm took away our happiness.

The Communists conquered South Vietnam after the Americans left, and my parents worried how life would be. I could see wrinkles come over their faces. In 1975 the Communists took my father to a concentration camp, we did not have enough food to eat so we saved what food we had for my mother so she could eat and work. We only had one meal a day. Sometimes I was so hungry I would sneak into my mother's kitchen and have a spoon of soup. I looked at the weary faces of my relatives. Everyone was tired and hungry. There was no food at all except leaves from the trees. I often went to school hungry, but I studied hard to make my mother happy, because she told me we are poor, but if you want to have a brighter future you must study very hard. I thought that a boy like me coming to USA was like a Christian going to Heaven. I believe that we would never make it, but after two failures we finally escaped to America.

I love America as I did my own country. I don't have to worry about someone taking my father to prison unjustly or stopping me from leaving. I have the right to stand as tall as everybody else. I wish I could tell

every American how truly precious their freedom is and not to take it for granted.

Mr. Speaker, this young 9-year-old boy is proud to be in America. He can stand tall. He can go to school and learn. He can eat and not be hungry. He is free.

Sometimes, as Americans, we do not realize just how lucky we are. We do not realize how horrible it is to live under Communist rule. We do not realize how it feels to have hunger pains, to have one of our parents taken away to a concentration camp, or to live in fear of another attack on our towns and our families.

□ 1950

THINGS THAT GO KABOOM

Another issue that was brought to my attention just today by one of my friends in the House was an article that was written by R. Emmet Tyrell, Jr., in the Washington Post on April 23, 1984, and the title of that article was "Things That Go Kaboom." I would like to read just a little bit of that article to you because I think it bears upon the freedom I just talked about that this young Vietnamese boy has finally attained by coming to the United States of America.

How very much like our 535 U.S. Congressmen and Senators are those sadly unappreciated mines now floating in Puerto Corinto, Puerto Sandino, and El Bluff off the progressive Nicaraguan coast, and how curious it is that so many of these 535 Machiavels now rail against them. These are mines whose only talent is to let off shocking fortissimos of noise. They do not sink ships. They hardly damage them. All they do is fulminate, and yet they have been the object of indignant yells from Congressmen and Senators, many of whom are themselves mere fulminators.

Our loud and theatrical Congressmen cannot effect a balanced budget. They cannot cut the deficit. They cannot stop the spread of unfriendly Marxist regimes in Central America. All they can do is go kaboom when they brush up against a genuine question of American national interest, much as our mines merely go kaboom when they brush up against a ship laden with arms to strengthen Nicaragua's anti-American regime or El Salvador's anti-American rebels.

These mines, or course, destroy themselves during their great glorious outbursts, and it is not unthinkable that our noisy Machiavels are destroying themselves too. The American electorate is not going to be pleased when faced with the increased danger of Central American bases abounding in Soviet missiles, guerrilla fighters and terrorists.

In Central America there is a growing threat to American Security, very few interested observers remain in doubt as to this. According to the bipartisan Kissinger Commission Report, "The Commission encountered no leader in Central America, including democratic and unarmed Costa Rica; who did not express deep foreboding about the impact of a militarized, totalitarian Nicaragua on the peace and security of the entire region." To be ignorant of this danger

one has to be a left-wing ideologue or a self-righteous inhabitant of Capitol Hill.

Of course, all those who voted last week against our involvement in mining Nicaraguan ports solemnly claim that they will not allow another Cuba in Central America. Senator Christopher Dodd (D-Conn.) said it himself last April 27 when, in delivering the Democrats' response, he proclaimed, "We will oppose the establishment of Marxist states in Central America."

Well, on what ground can he and his colleagues make good on his promises? If, as they say, international law proscribes us from assisting the Nicaraguan freedom fighters in mining Nicaraguan ports, what sacred passage in international law will allow them to "oppose the establishment of Marxist States in Central America"? Furthermore, how are they going to "oppose" the establishment of these states by exploding in oratory on Capitol Hill?

On ABC's "This Week With David Brinkley," Senator Patrick Leahy (D-Vt) went so far as to say that were Nicaragua to allow the emplacement of Soviet missile sites, "We would have the opportunity, in fact the right, to go in and remove that."

Well, if international law bars us from stopping hostile shipping into Nicaragua, how will Senator Leahy justify the immensely more costly and dangerous task of removing missile sites—Soviet missile sites from that area?

Comes that grim day when the Soviets do in Nicaragua what they have done in Cuba, the Machiavels of Capitol Hill will lose themselves again in oratory and pettifoggery. That is all. The fact is they do not want to do anything about the growing danger in our hemisphere. They lack the pluck. They believe in what we might call the enduring present, a present that finds them very comfortable and unbothered about tomorrow.

Thus, there is farce. In Central America others fight our battles. On Capitol Hill the orators thunder against the CIA, as though it were our enemy. Last week as money ran out for those Nicaraguan freedom fighters who might bring to their country the peace our troops brought to Grenada, the Capitol Hill Machiavels indulged their appetite for noise and theater by pursuing the vexed procedural question of who in the CIA had told whom in Congress about what and in how many sentences.

Senator Daniel Moynihan, Democrat of New York, says the CIA vouchsafed him but one sentence, that is, and so he will resign as vice chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. How many sentences would have prevented this calamity, and how many words per sentence, the Senator did not divulge. Meanwhile, the wars in Central America spread.

Freedom is directly tied to the stopping of Communist aggression, not only in our hemisphere but throughout the rest of the world. This young Vietnamese refugee who is not in the United States and who enjoys freedom summed it up very well in the last sentence of his speech when he gave it in Georgia. I would like to once again repeat that:

I wish I could tell every American how truly precious their freedom is and to not take it for granted.

We must address these issues in our hemisphere. Otherwise, our freedom is jeopardized.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). The Chair would remind the gentleman from Indiana that he should not mention, under the rules of the House, Members of the other body by name or quote Members in the other body.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I was not aware that I could not read a newspaper article that named those. Is that a fact?

I know I cannot mention them in my speech, but when quoting a newspaper article, is it permissible?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The rule still applies.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, I stand corrected. I thank the Chair.

SYNTHETIC FUELS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Illinois, TOM CORCORAN, has devoted considerable attention to the synthetic fuels program during his 6 years on the Energy and Commerce Committee. When congressional interest in promoting domestic production of synthetic fuels heightened in 1979, Tom represented Republican members of the old Energy and Power Subcommittee in Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee deliberations on various proposals. Today, as the senior Republican member of the Energy and Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Fossil and Synthetic Fuels, Tom continues to evaluate the synfuels program now administered by the independent Federal Synthetic Fuels Corporation.

On Tuesday, April 24, the synthetic fuels group of the American Petroleum Institute had the opportunity to discuss synfuels policy with Tom, and I insert his address in the RECORD at this point:

SYNFUELS—A MIDDLE COURSE ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN TOM CORCORAN

Synthetic Fuels. Before we ask, "Where is it going?", let's ask, "Where has it been?"

In 1979 I voted for a \$3 billion research and development bill produced by the House Banking Committee as an amendment to the Defense Production Act.

It was argued, and I agreed, that the national security would be advanced by publicly-sponsored research into how to produce liquid transportation fuels from our domestic resources of coal.

Shortly after that modest (only in Washington is \$3 billion "modest") bill passed the House, several events occurred:

1. The Iranian Revolution and subsequent import disruptions,
2. The Election Year, and
3. Jimmy Carter caught "malaise".

The result was the Congress overreacted to the Iranian Revolution and was looking to "do something". The modest \$3 billion R&D bill became a huge \$80 plus billion "Commercialization" bill. Where was the usual caution that can slow down a "new

idea" until it can be examined? The Election Year had the Carter White House focusing on methods to avoid electoral losses in oil and gas producing states without creating losses in consuming states—and spending a great deal of public money usually is the answer. And, to overcome "malaise", something very big was necessary.

The Senate added billions and billions to the bill as one committee after another competed to outdo the other. Remember, this was a bill which would surely be signed into law and so it tended to attract all of the pet projects which never could command enough support on their own. The bill grew to a final tally of roughly \$93 billion, with \$88 billion for synfuels.

In as brief a story as I can retell it, that's the atmosphere in which Congress created the Energy Security Act. I voted against the final conference report not just because of the high price tag but also because the central mission of the original bill had been lost in the frenzy.

It is no surprise to many in this room that I am no supporter of the Energy Security Act, but you may well be surprised to know that I am a supporter of government-funded research for synthetic fuels. I introduced a bill a year ago that would realign the mission of the SFC to research and development and reduce its budget to \$3 billion.

As I noted, one reason the Energy Security Act became law and the Synthetic Fuels Corporation was created was to accelerate development of a synthetic fuels industry in America so that we could back out foreign oil. In 1978, you may recall, we were dependent upon imports for 42 percent of our oil supply, and in the aftermath of the revolution in Iran we became painfully aware of what that extent of dependence meant. Synfuels were seen by many as a substantial element in reducing our import dependence.

Since 1979 and 1980, the portion of our oil supply which is imported has dramatically declined, to 34 percent in 1981 and, at the present time, to 29 percent, according to the Department of Energy's Energy Information Administration. Still, with increased energy demand due to the continuing strong economic recovery quite likely resulting in higher imports, especially with the equivalent of a million barrels of oil a day in natural gas supplies being "shut in" (according to Energy Department testimony not long ago), there is concern that another devastating "oil crisis" could occur. That is the most common justification offered by those who say we need the Synthetic Fuels Corporation as it was constituted by Congress in 1980. I disagree. Massive subsidies to synfuels projects are not the way to energy security.

Imported oil is the marginal supply, and its cost is thus higher than domestic supplies—about \$29 a barrel today. Synthetic fuels will never be substituted for imports on a permanent basis unless they are less expensive. Contemporary synfuels technologies yield products costing more than twice as much as imported oil's current price. Even if oil import prices go up, they will undoubtedly be far lower than the \$70-\$80 a barrel price of synthetic oil from coal or the \$67 a barrel shale oil price. Synfuels simply cannot be competitively priced when produced with current technology.

What we must do, I believe, is to restructure the federal synfuels program, investing in research on and development of technologies which may yield cost-competitive synthetic fuels. Spending \$15 billion on subsidies under the present Synthetic Fuels Cor-

poration mandate does not provide the market test needed to ensure that synfuels will play a long-term role in our energy future.

I am not supporter of the current synthetic fuel program but am no opponent of synthetic fuels or even of government support for them. My view is simply this:

1. That Congress was not at its best when it wrote the Energy Security Act and it ought to amend it;

2. That the energy market has become substantially more competitive as a result of oil decontrol, a policy I supported wholeheartedly;

3. That every investor in any new energy project, but especially high-risk ventures, needs to keep one eye on the market and another on its costs;

4. That technologies that seemed ready for commercialization in the expectation of ever-rising energy prices may not be ready at all for the tougher reality of the energy market of the 1980's and 1990's; and

That the public will tolerate high government spending for only so long without demanding an accounting. Every program better be ready to pass the test at the time given.

Does that sound like the opinion of "one of the most vociferous critics of the Synfuels Corporation" as the Oil Daily called me in February? Or does it sound like any prudent member of one of your Boards of Directors meetings to discuss a potential investment in synthetic fuels?

I want to pause a moment and ask you to imagine yourself in my shoes, a Congressman with taxpayers worried about the prospects of even higher taxes if the government cannot control its spending. But also consider yourself as a Director of the SFC who believes—as I do—that some role for Federal spending is appropriate but who is limited to "commercialization" when the very best scientists tell you that further research is necessary.

There is indeed a middle course. It is my basic theme today to tell you that the Energy Security Act needs to be amended not just to save Federal funds but in fact to save the synfuels program.

There is support for synfuels research among those taxpayers I represent because they believe—as I do—that at some point this country may well need to tap the huge resources of domestic energy trapped today. But moving too fast with too much ambition and too little homework will endanger the support for synfuels research.

Let me try to explain the current unrest with synfuels on Capitol Hill. First I believe that the design of the current program—its huge fund, the concentration on commercialization—is the heart of the problem.

The allegations of malfeasance, of misdirection and of mismanagement by the SFC all add to the theater of Congress' current disfavor with its own child. I have to admit it's more than a bit fickle, if not phony, for Congress to gush \$93 billion on synfuels in 1980 and rush to renege four years later.

All the focus on "the personalities and the peccadilloes" disturbs me more than you may realize. It removes the focus of the debate from the policy, which I would like to see seriously explored, to one of personnel.

What I would like to impress upon you is that if the current program is never amended by Congress, or to the extent possible by real leadership at the SFC, then the program will ultimately fail. And this failure will mean a loss not just of public monies on

technologies not ready for the rigors of highly competitive world market, but also loss of the public's confidence. Support for any program can, over time, grow so thin that it goes beyond rescue, beyond salvage, beyond realignment. The Clinch River Breeder reactor is a perfect example. When that happens, those of us who argued to replace the program with one capable of passing the test of the market and of the public trust will also have failed.

I supported the Clinch River Breeder Reactor for many years, and still do. I am a supporter because I believe that America needs to invest in maintaining its leadership in nuclear power and Clinch River is the kind of research and development project that will help us to do that. Yet this Congress, despite support from the President and his Secretary of Energy, killed funding for Clinch River. Some say it was because its most visible supporter, senator Howard Baker, became a lame duck when he announced his retirement. Well, Senator Baker would have retired one day. No, I believe the reason is that the opponents of Clinch River had a long-term strategy to cut its funding while the supporters of the Breeder Reactor stayed on the defensive, playing brinkmanship. "Toughing it out" isn't necessarily the wiser course than compromise in politics, especially when you forfeit the middle ground.

Support for Synfuels in Congress can go the same way. But it need not.

Here is my suggestion. Realign the synfuels program to sponsor the research necessary to refine various technologies so that when the market genuinely is ready, the technology will be. A new plan for synfuels that acknowledges the competitive market which exists for all energy types will be much healthier for the synfuels industry in the long run.

The Synthetic Fuels Corporation could start this reexamination. By June 30, the SFC is required to submit to Congress the "comprehensive strategy" for how it will meet the goals established by the Energy Security Act. Why not add a more timely challenge—why not plan to meet the challenges of the market and of the public trust by proposing to Congress that more research and development is needed and that "commercialization" in this country ought to mean the private sector.

Today there are 186 co-sponsors of a bill, introduced by Congressman Howard Wolpe, to suspend all SFC funding until both Houses of Congress approve the comprehensive strategy by joint resolution. Many of these co-sponsors, myself included, would support a realigned synthetic fuels program while others opposed the Clinch River Breeder Reactor. The point is that a near majority of the House of Representatives is showing its disapproval of the current program. Why shouldn't supporters of synfuels come forward with their own alternative?

This may well return support for the synfuels program to Congress. As of now, support is waning. Chairman John Dingell has called for the resignation of two SFC Board members, (Messrs. Noble and Thompson), while the White House has announced its intention to nominate one replacement, Eric Reichl, who Energy Daily called a "Synfuels virtuoso."

Since the SFC must have four board members to constitute a quorum, isn't that just one step forward, two steps back?

I want to leave you with this one observation. The Energy Security Act, a \$93 billion overreaction of government intervention

into the energy industry, was created during the tempest of the Carter-Mondale reelection effort of 1980. But candidates Walter Mondale and Gary Hart, both supporters of government intervention in the energy markets generally, have come out for abolishing the SFC.

I believe that the policy of the synfuels program should be changed. If it is not, it may not survive for long.

It may seem that the SFC is ready to commit nearly all its \$15 billion and that supporters of synfuels would be foolhardy to "cut a deal" on the advent of such a large check in the mail. Remember Clinch River—those funds were cut years after private money was expended after one ironclad promise of government after another. Don't be so sure the check won't bounce.

As we say on Capitol Hill: When you don't have the votes, cut a deal. When you cut a deal early, you get a better deal.

Think about it.●

SMALL BUSINESSES SAY NO TO CREDIT CARD SURCHARGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the battle over whether credit card surcharges should be banned is often put in the context of big against little, with those in favor of surcharges claiming that surcharges are the only way small merchants can fairly recover the allegedly burdensome costs of credit cards imposed by the large credit card issuers. Nothing could be further from the truth, and my mail on this issue is proof of this.

Those who favor credit card surcharges claim that cash customers subsidize credit card customers because merchants must pay a merchant discount, or fee, to the credit card issuer for honoring a credit card. A Federal Reserve study claims this fee typically ranges between 1 and 5 percent of the amount of the charge. According to surcharge proponents, this amount is passed along to all customers in the form of higher prices. Surcharge proponents make this claim even though the Federal Reserve found that the cost of credit represents only 1 percent of the retail price of an item. For many merchants, the cost is even less, as low as one-half of 1 percent.

Merchants are supposedly in favor of surcharges because it would permit them to allocate the so-called hidden costs of credit cards to the affluent credit card customers from the less affluent customers. In the eyes of the surcharge proponents, surcharges would enable merchants to stop having the poor subsidizing the rich.

What do merchants think of surcharges? After all, why would merchants want to anger their cash customers by making them pay for a service they do not receive? In a broader context, do merchants anger their pe-

destrian customers by offering free parking to customers who use the parking lot free of charge? Or are both of these costs borne by merchants to attract and serve customers?

The letters that I have received from merchants indicate that the small merchants of America oppose credit card surcharges. These merchants are the backbone of the retailing industry. They know what is beneficial for their businesses and their customers and they oppose credit card surcharges.

Consider a letter I have received from the Professional Cleaners' Association. This trade association represents carpet, furniture, and drapery cleaners in all 50 States. It opposes credit card surcharges:

Surcharge legislation would increase consumer costs * * * since small companies * * * would be forced to carry burdensome accounts receivable, stand bad check losses and suffer collection costs associated with credit operations. These cumulative costs would, in our opinion, far exceed the 5 percent to 6 percent range.

For this group of small merchants, the impact of surcharges would be immeasurably damaging and would inevitably lead to overall loss of business and higher consumer prices.

The Chicagoland Bowling Proprietors Association also opposes credit card surcharges. The association, which represents over 130 bowling establishments with more than 250,000 bowlers in the Chicago area, believes that Congress should "permanently ban any surcharge of any type on credit card purchases."

Individual businesses have written in opposition to surcharges as well. Linwood M. Aron, a real estate appraiser and consultant from Richmond, VA, wrote that "a surcharge on charges made on credit cards is both arbitrary and inflationary." Larry E. Dixon, president of MAP International of Wheaton, IL, points out that for travelers "it would be extremely difficult to depend on carrying cash and traveler's checks."

Small businesses are not fooled by the rhetoric emanating from the proponents of credit card surcharges. They know that surcharges are a bad idea for consumers, and a bad idea for businesses. It is time that surcharge proponents start listening to those businesses who they seek to help by allowing surcharges, and start understanding what those businesses are saying: Vote no on surcharges!●

MARY GAIL BLACK: A GREAT CITIZEN OF SAN LUIS OBISPO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, on April 27, the San Luis Obispo Democratic Central Committee will pay trib-

ute to Mary Gail Black, a great citizen of San Luis Obispo who has made enormous contributions to the community since she moved there several decades ago. I would like to take this opportunity to join in that tribute and to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House the career of this remarkable woman.

After a career in journalism and publishing, with a summa cum laude degree from the University of California at Berkeley and a masters degree from Smith College earned along the way, Ms. Black moved to San Luis Obispo in the early 1950's, in time to work there on Adlai Stevenson's Presidential campaign. She has led three county campaigns since that time, including two congressional campaigns and a State senate campaign. Since 1962, she has been a member of the San Luis Obispo County Democratic Central Committee and has served as both chair and vice chair of the committee. For 3 years in the mid-1970's, Ms. Black coedited the Central Democrat, a local newsletter. She is a founding member of the San Luis Obispo Democratic Club.

In addition to her activities in the political sphere, Ms. Black has been very active in community affairs. She is a founding member of the local World Affairs Council and has held several leadership positions in the American Association of University Women. For 20 years, she worked as a volunteer for the Cancer Society, and for 3 years, she was a member of the Diocesan Council for the Episcopal Diocese of California. Finally, after 4 years on the Area Agency Council for the Aging, Ms. Black has recently been elected as a member of its board of directors.

Mr. Speaker, Mary Gail Black is a woman who has committed her life to the betterment of her community, the Nation, and the world. Her spirit of dedication is an inspiration to all of us, and I know all of my colleagues join me in paying tribute to her today. It takes citizens like Mary Gail Black to make democracy work, and Ms. Black can be proud of the great contribution she has made through the years.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NELSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to official business yesterday, Tuesday, April 24, I missed one vote.

On rollcall No. 91, final passage for S. 373, the Arctic Research and Policy Act, I would have voted "aye" had I been present.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I was absent yesterday for the vote on S. 373, Arctic Research/Critical Materials Policy, rollcall No. 91.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."●

THE JAMIE WHITTEN DELTA STATES RESEARCH CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation that would designate the Delta States Research Center in Stoneville, MS, as the Jamie Whitten Delta States Research Center.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to honor the dean of the House and the dean of the Mississippi delegation in this way. He has been closely related to the agricultural communities for many years. His contributions to the farm have been innumerable.

I think it is especially fitting that the Delta States Research Center be renamed to honor Chairman WHITTEN. He was instrumental in the establishment of the center in Stoneville. His continual influence and support for agricultural research both at this center and nationwide has contributed much to the current role the United States plays in worldwide agriculture.

Our dean is renowned and widely acclaimed as one of the foremost authorities in the U.S. Congress on agricultural research. His national leadership has certainly had an influence on the ongoing programs that are being initiated at the Midsouth regional headquarters at Stoneville. I cannot think of a better name for this research center and I am pleased to take this opportunity to seek the change from the Delta States Research Center to the Jamie Whitten Delta States Research Center.●

COKE PRODUCTION FALLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, an essential element in steelmaking is coke, a material made from metallurgical coal. The importance of this material cannot be underestimated, for without it, a good deal of the steel used by this Nation could not be produced.

A situation has developed in which domestic coke production has precipitously fallen. In 1982, U.S. coke pro-

duction was only 28 million tons, down from 60.5 million tons 10 years earlier. Obviously, the demand for metallurgical coal and coke is derived primarily from the demand for pig iron and raw steel. Hence, the declining trend in coke production and metallurgical coal use is due primarily to the slump in steelmaking.

However, the ability of domestic coke producers to respond to a sudden and unexpected increase in demand for coke has been eroded. A great many coke ovens have been shut down and those which are operating are growing old and less efficient. According to a recent report by Paine Webber Mitchell Hutchins, Inc., entitled "World Coke Dynamics," an age profile shows troubled times ahead with much capacity close to the threshold of useful life and effective productivity rates. The study adds that USA coke capacity seems within 5 years of serious over-age problems and productivity losses unless major investments are soon made.

Perhaps the most startling finding of the study is that by 1985 U.S. coke capacity could fall short of demand by 5 to 9 million short tons.

Indeed, in 1978 an 8 million short ton domestic coke shortfall did occur. Domestic coke stocks dropped by 46 percent and the United States imported 5.7 million short tons of coke in order to meet steelmaking demands. However, if the United States was facing a national emergency, it is doubtful that imported tonnage could have been obtained quickly enough to meet defense-related steel requirements.

I would also point out that if those 8 million short tons of coke had been produced by domestic coke ovens, U.S. metallurgical coal production would have been 11.7 million short tons greater than it was, providing for 3,256 coal miner jobs.

The dire prospect of the U.S. steel industry operating at an artificially low rate because of growing constraints on domestic coke production exists. Such a situation would have grave consequences on the Nation in the event of a national emergency.

For this reason, today I am introducing legislation which would add coke to the national defense stockpile. I believe such a requirement would fulfill the two criteria placed on materials which are considered strategic and/or critical for stockpile purposes by the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Revision Act of 1979. First, the material would be needed to supply the military, industrial and essential civilian needs of the United States during a national emergency. Second, the material is not found or produced in the United States in sufficient quantities to meet such need.

Under current law, the Federal Emergency Management Agency is the

executive agency primarily responsible for setting acquisition goals for materials to be stockpiled. The basic criteria used for this purpose is the determination of how much material would be needed during a wartime emergency lasting 3 years. As such, the bill I am introducing directs the President to acquire a 3-year supply of coke. This coke would be purchased by FEMA from domestic coke ovens which use domestically produced metallurgical coal.

According to a CRS analysis of this situation, between 47.5 million and 63.5 million short tons of coke would be needed under the stockpiling scenario outlined by my bill based on data relevant to the 3-year period of 1985 to 1987.

Mr. Speaker, purchasing coke through long-term contracts for the national defense stockpile would have the effect of encouraging steelmakers to invest in new and more modern coke ovens.

The requirement to stock coke would also work to stimulate the demand for metallurgical coal. Currently, it takes 1.5 tons of metallurgical coal to produce 1 ton of coke. Coke is produced by heating metallurgical coal to very high temperatures in the absence of air. The general requirements for coking coal to be designated as a metallurgical coal are a volatile matter of up to 35 percent, a low-sulfur content and a low, but uniform, ash content. The coke is then combined with iron ore and limestone in a blast furnace to produce pig iron which is transferred to a steelmaking furnace.

As such, this legislation would stimulate the production of between 71.25 and 95.25 million short tons of low-volatile, low-sulfur metallurgical coal. Much of this type of coal is produced in southern West Virginia, Virginia, and eastern Kentucky.

While I realize that the 1979 act established guidelines for the President to follow in determining which materials should be included in the stockpile, I am making this legislative initiative to add coke because of this administration's record of ignoring the value coal holds for national security goals. When we have an administration that does not recognize the importance of coal to national energy goals—or for that matter does not even deem it important to have an energy policy—I hardly think it will consider the critical importance of coal for national security purposes.

Currently, FEMA is stocking a wide variety of minerals and materials including those in the aluminum metal group, asbestos, bauxite, chromium, copper, lead, rubber, and tin. Surely, coke has an equal value as these elements during a time of national emergency. ●

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of my special order speech this evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WEISS (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for April 24 and 25, on account of illness.

Mr. ACKERMAN (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), on April 25, on account of official business.

Mr. SKELTON (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for the week of April 24, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CORCORAN, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. BATEMAN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. WALKER, for 60 minutes, on April 30.

Mr. WEBER, for 60 minutes, on April 30.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, on April 30.

Mr. WALKER, for 60 minutes, on May 1.

Mr. WEBER, for 60 minutes, on May 1.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, on May 1.

Mr. WALKER, for 60 minutes, on May 2.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, on May 2.

Mr. WEBER, for 60 minutes, on May 2.

Mr. WALKER, for 60 minutes, on May 3.

Mr. WEBER, for 60 minutes, on May 3.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, on May 3.

Mr. MICHEL, for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RICHARDSON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. NELSON, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. RAHALL, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, today.
 Mr. PANETTA, for 60 minutes, on May 1.
 1. Mr. REID, for 60 minutes, on May 1.
 Mr. LANTOS, for 60 minutes, on May 1.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. DELLUMS and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$2,183.

Mr. GREGG, to include a letter in the RECORD that he spoke of during debate on H.R. 4974 in the Committee of the Whole today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DANNEMEYER in three instances.
 Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE in two instances.
 Mr. BADHAM.
 Mr. CORCORAN.
 Mrs. JOHNSON.
 Mr. HYDE in two instances.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio in three instances.
 Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
 Mr. SOLOMON.
 Mr. FRENZEL.
 Mr. KEMP.
 Mr. GREEN.
 Mr. SILJANDER in two instances.
 Mr. O'BRIEN.
 Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
 Mr. MCKINNEY.
 Mr. CLINGER.
 Mr. GILMAN.
 Mr. MOLINARI.
 Mr. GEKAS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RICHARDSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. UDALL.
 Mr. RODINO.
 Mr. RAHALL.
 Mr. MATSUI in three instances.
 Mr. DYSON.
 Mr. GAYDOS in three instances.
 Mr. FORD of Michigan.
 Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.
 Mr. MOLLOHAN.
 Mr. STARK.
 Mr. MCHUGH.
 Mr. GARCIA in three instances.
 Mr. SMITH of Florida.
 Mr. KOSTMAYER.
 Mr. CHAPPELL in two instances.
 Mr. BOUCHER.
 Mr. FRANK.
 Mr. GEJDENSON in two instances.
 Mr. LELAND.
 Mr. BERMAN in two instances.
 Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. ROE.
 Mr. LANTOS in two instances.
 Mr. ERDREICH.
 Mr. OLIN.
 Mr. SISISKY.
 Mr. MCCLOSKEY.
 Mr. FLORIO.
 Ms. MIKULSKI.
 Mr. FAUNTROY.
 Mr. STUDDS.
 Mr. HARKIN.
 Mr. SHELBY.
 Mr. HAMILTON.
 Mr. GORE.
 Mr. LONG of Louisiana.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 26, 1984, at 11 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports of various individuals and delegations traveling under authorizations from the Speaker concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by them during the first quarter of calendar year 1984 in connection with foreign travel pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ASIA AND ITALY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 7 AND JAN. 22, 1984

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Debra Cabral	1/7	1/9	Hong Kong	2,843.80	366.00						366.00
	1/10	1/13	Thailand	10,167.50	444.00		57.67		77.71		579.38
	1/14	1/16	Pakistan	4,399.92	324.00				13.21		337.21
	1/17	1/18	Turkey	33,113	108.00						108.00
	1/18	1/22	Rome	876,168	516.00						516.00
Military air transport							7,887.57				7,887.57
James Rowan	1/7	1/9	Hong Kong	2,843.80	366.00						366.00
	1/10	1/13	Thailand	10,167.50	444.00		57.67		77.71		579.38
	1/14	1/16	Pakistan	4,399.92	324.00				13.21		337.21
	1/17	1/18	Turkey	33,113	108.00						108.00
	1/18	1/22	Rome	876,168	516.00						516.00
Military air transport							7,887.57				7,887.57
Committee total				3,516.00			15,890.48		181.84		19,588.32

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DEBRA M. CABRAL, FEB. 21, 1984.

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ASIA AND ITALY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 7 AND JAN. 22, 1984

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Debra Cabral	1/7	1/10	Hong Kong	2,843.80	366.00		31.86		47.92		445.78
	1/10	1/14	Thailand	10,167.50	444.00		57.67		58.48		560.15

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ASIA AND ITALY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 7 AND JAN. 22, 1984—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
	1/14	1/16	Pakistan	4,399.92	324.00				32.45		356.45
	1/17	1/18	Turkey	33,113	108.00		7.50		34.44		149.94
	1/18	1/21	Italy	876,168	516.00		54.61		70.14		640.75
Military air transport							7,887.56				7,887.56
James Rowan	1/7	1/10	Hong Kong	2,843.80	366.00		31.86		47.92		445.78
	1/10	1/14	Thailand	10,167.50	44.00		57.67		58.48		560.15
	1/14	1/16	Pakistan	4,399.92	324.00				32.45		356.45
	1/17	1/18	Turkey	33,113	108.00		7.50		34.44		149.94
	1/18	1/21	Italy	876,168	516.00		54.61		70.14		640.75
Military air transport							7,887.56				7,887.56
Committee total					3,516.00		16,078.40		486.86		20,081.26

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DEBRA CABRAL, Mar. 26, 1984.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO INDIA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 13 AND FEB. 22, 1984

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Lisa Gomer	2/13	2/21	India		774.00		* 2,421.00		* 10.74		3,205.74
			India				* 178.05				178.05
	2/21	2/22	Nepal		150.00		* 284.00				434.00
Michael Teitelbaum	2/15	2/21	India		516.00		* 2,427.00		10.74		2,953.74
			India				* 178.05				178.05
	2/21	2/22	Nepal		150.00		* 284.00				434.00
Committee total					1,590.00		5,772.10		21.48		7,383.58

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

* Air.

* Miscellaneous.

* Can.

LISA GOMER, Mar. 22, 1984.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 15 AND FEB. 21, 1984

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Levitas, E. H.	2/15	2/17	France		182.00						182.00
	2/17	2/21	Sweden		488.00						488.00
Commercial transportation							3,576.00				3,576.00
Abbruzzese, P. A.	2/15	2/17	France		182.00						182.00
	2/17	2/21	Sweden		488.00						488.00
Commercial transportation							3,709.00				3,709.00
Committee total					1,340.00		7,285.00				8,625.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS, Mar. 15, 1984.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOSEPH R. RUTLEDGE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 10 AND FEB. 13, 1984

Name of member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Joseph Robert Rutledge	2/10	2/13	Grenada								399.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOE RUTLEDGE, Mar. 14, 1984.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL DELEGATION TO SOUTH AMERICA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 3 AND JAN. 17, 1984

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Campbell, Frances	1/3	1/5	Costa Rica		150.00				142.23		292.23
	1/5	1/9	Peru		300.00				100.85		400.85
	1/9	1/11	Argentina		225.00				70.24		295.24
	1/11	1/15	Brazil		342.00				339.63		681.63
	1/15	1/16	Barbados		156.00				102.76		258.76
	1/16	1/16	Grenada						60.45		60.45
	1/16	1/17	Jamaica		109.00				80.91		189.91
							6,823.82				6,823.82
Military transportation											
Commercial transportation							137.19				137.19
Gille, Kathy	1/3	1/5	Costa Rica		150.00				142.23		292.23
	1/5	1/9	Peru		300.00				100.85		400.85
	1/9	1/11	Argentina		225.00				70.24		295.24
	1/11	1/15	Brazil		342.00				339.63		681.63
	1/15	1/16	Barbados		156.00				102.76		258.76
	1/16	1/16	Grenada						60.45		60.45
	1/16	1/17	Jamaica		109.00				80.91		189.91
							6,823.82				6,823.82
Military transportation											
Commercial transportation							137.19				137.19
Killen, Carson	1/3	1/5	Costa Rica		150.00				142.23		292.23
	1/5	1/9	Peru		300.00				100.85		400.85
	1/9	1/11	Argentina		225.00				70.24		295.24
	1/11	1/15	Brazil		342.00				339.63		681.63
	1/15	1/16	Barbados		156.00				102.76		258.76
	1/16	1/16	Grenada						60.45		60.45
	1/16	1/17	Jamaica		109.00				80.91		189.91
							6,823.82				6,823.82
Military transportation											
Commercial transportation							137.19				137.19
Mellody, Charles	1/3	1/5	Costa Rica		150.00				142.23		292.23
	1/5	1/9	Peru		300.00				100.85		400.85
	1/9	1/11	Argentina		225.00				70.24		295.24
	1/11	1/15	Brazil		342.00				339.63		681.63
	1/15	1/16	Barbados		156.00				102.76		258.76
	1/16	1/16	Grenada						60.45		60.45
	1/16	1/17	Jamaica		109.00				80.91		189.91
							6,823.82				6,823.82
Military transportation											
Commercial transportation							137.19				137.19
Committee total					5,128.00		27,844.04		3,588.28		36,560.32

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CARSON K. KILLEN, Mar. 29, 1984.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3208. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual animal welfare enforcement report for fiscal year 1983, pursuant to Public Law 89-544, section 25 (84 Stat. 1565); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3209. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Military Personnel and Force Management), transmitting a report on defense contractors and consultants who during the past 3 years held positions of GS-13 or above within the Department, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2397(e) (96 Stat. 1293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3210. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting information on the real and personal property of the Department as of September 30, 1983, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2701(b); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3211. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a report on the community development, rehabilitation loan, and the urban homesteading programs, pursuant to Public Law 93-383, section 113(a) (91 Stat. 1124); Public Law 88-560, section 312(k) (92 Stat. 2081; 93 Stat. 1101) and Public Law 93-383, section 810(e); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

3212. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled, "Follow-up Audit of the University

of the District of Columbia's Athletic Department", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 455(d); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3213. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled, "Reported Purchase of LaMancha, Inc.", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 455(d); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3214. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting the 1983 annual report of the National Technical Institute for the Deaf, pursuant to Public Law 89-36, section 5(b)(3); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3215. A letter from the Executive Vice President, National Industries for the Blind, transmitting its annual report for 1983; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3216. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend and amend programs under the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act, and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3217. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a list of GAO reports that were issued in March, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(h); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3218. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting a report on the Commission's activities under the Freedom of Information Act during 1983, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3219. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Mediation Board, transmit-

ting a report on the Board's compliance with the laws relating to open meetings of agencies of the Government (Government in the Sunshine Act) during 1983, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3220. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1110 of title 11, United States Code, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3221. A letter from the Special Counsel, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting his review of the Veterans' Administration's investigation of allegations of a violation of regulations, abuse of authority, and a substantial and specific danger to public health and safety at the VA Medical Center, Murfreesboro, Tenn., pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1206(b)(5)(A) (92 Stat. 1125); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

3222. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Banking Finance and Urban Affairs.

3223. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1985 and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 1244. A bill to amend the provisions of title 31, United States Code, relating to the President's budget to require it to separately identify and summarize the capital investment expenditures of the United States, to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to require the Secretary of Commerce to conduct an inventory and assessment of the Nation's public facilities, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 98-153, Pt. II). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MOAKLEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 490. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 2570, a bill to continue the transition provisions of the Bankruptcy Act until May 26, 1984, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 98-698). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 491, providing for the consideration of H.R. 4275, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain hydroelectric powerplants at various existing water projects, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 98-699). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ASPIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 5027. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify procedures for payment of military retired pay to spouses and former spouses of members of the uniformed services in compliance with court orders without amendment (Rept. No. 98-700). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 5051. A bill to give permanent effect to the provisions of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 relating to the reimbursement of United States commercial fishermen for certain losses incurred incident to the seizure of their vessels by foreign nations; with amendments (Rept. No. 98-701). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 4585. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Office of Environmental Quality and the Council on Environmental Quality for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987; with amendments (Rept. No. 98-702). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 4921. A bill to provide for the selection of additional lands for inclusion within the Bon Secour National Wildlife Refuge; with amendments (Rept. No. 98-703). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 5050. A bill to extend until October 1, 1986, the authority and authorization of appropriations for certain programs under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956; with amendments (Rept. No. 98-704). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 5271. A bill to extend the Wetlands Loan Act (Rept. No. 98-705). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. House Joint Resolution 537. Joint resolution designating the Brigantine and Barnegat units of the National Wildlife Refuge System as the Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge (Rept. No. 98-706). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 3987. A bill to improve the preservation and management of Federal records, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 98-707). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 4821. A bill to establish uniform audit requirements for State and local governments receiving Federal financial assistance; with an amendment (Rept. No. 98-708). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BOLAND: Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. House Resolution 467. Resolution directing the President of the United States to provide certain information to the House of Representatives concerning the Central Intelligence Agency and death squads in El Salvador (Rept. No. 98-709). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. SHUSTER):

H.R. 5504. A bill to apportion funds for construction of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways for fiscal years 1985 and 1986, to revise authorizations for mass transportation, to expand and improve the relocation assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. SNYDER) (by request):

H.R. 5505. A bill to amend title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CORCORAN:

H.R. 5506. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the rates of income tax on corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLORIO:

H.R. 5507. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to give the Federal Trade Commission authority with respect to certain regulations of the Civil Aeronautics Board relating to unfair acts or practices, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. GORE:

H.R. 5508. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require

manufacturers, importers, and distributors of medical devices to maintain certain records respecting the handling of complaints, analysis of device failures, and the return of devices; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HERTEL of Michigan:

H.R. 5509. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide civil penalties for false claims and statements made to the United States, to certain recipients of property, services, or money from the United States, or to parties to contracts with the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H.R. 5510. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a mechanism for taxpayers to designate overpayments of income tax, and to contribute other amounts, for purposes of reducing the public debt of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOSTMAYER:

H.R. 5511. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide incentive grants in order to encourage States to adopt and enforce laws requiring the use of safety belts by schoolchildren in new school buses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. MOLINARI:

H.R. 5512. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reinstate and reinforce the biological integrity of our Nation's waters; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself, Mr. LOTT, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, and Mr. FRANKLIN):

H.R. 5513. A bill to designate the Delta States Research Center in Stoneville, Miss., as the "Jamie Whitten Delta States Research Center"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 5514. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 100-percent tax credit for tuition paid for the education of any individual; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE (for himself and Mr. DICKINSON):

H.R. 5515. A bill to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to the unknown American who lost his life while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam era and who has been selected to be buried in the Memorial Amphitheater at Arlington National Cemetery; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 5516. A bill to require that a 3-year supply of coke be acquired for the national defense stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER:

H.R. 5517. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for certain additional experts and consultants for the General Accounting Office, to provide for certain additional positions within the General Accounting Office Senior Executive Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SUNDQUIST:

H.R. 5518. A bill to require high-buoyancy life vests aboard commercial aircraft; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. RICHARDSON):

H.R. 5519. A bill to reauthorize and amend the Indian Financing Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. McCloskey, Mr. Emerson, Mr. Walgren, Mr. Kastenmeier, Mr. Roth, Mr. Harkin, Mr. Annunzio, Mr. Weaver, Mr. Evans of Iowa, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Chappie, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Pritchard, Mr. Jones of North Carolina, Mr. Broyhill, Ms. Kaptur, Mr. Morrison of Washington, Mr. Chandler, Mr. Swift, Mr. Owens, Mr. Evans of Illinois, Mr. Fautroy, Mr. Won Pat, Mr. Jenkins, Mr. Martin of New York, Mr. Towns, Mr. Jeffords, Mr. Alexander, Mr. Hefner, Mr. Gunderson, Mr. Bonior of Michigan, Mr. Lowry of Washington, Mr. Murphy, Mr. De La Garza, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Skelton, Mr. Dymally, Mr. Dorgan, Mr. Hammerschmidt, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Tauke, Mr. Boehlert, Mr. Volkmer, Mr. Horton, Mr. Dixon, Mrs. Smith of Nebraska, Mr. English, Mr. Kramer, Mr. Wolpe, Mr. Thomas of California, Mr. Shumway, Mr. Panetta, Mr. Smith of Florida, Mr. Frenzel, Mr. Aspin, Mr. Watkins, Mr. Wolf, Mr. Bates, Mr. Stenholm, Mr. Lewis of California, Mr. Robert F. Smith, Mr. Leland, Mr. Lagomarsino, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Rose, Mr. Stangeland, Mr. Perkins, Mr. Tallon, Mr. Skeen, Mr. Dicks, Mr. Corrada, Mr. Lundine, Mr. Roe, Mr. Shelby, Mr. Staggers, Mrs. Martin of Illinois, Mr. Moody, Mr. Vento, Mr. Kramer, and Mr. Petri):

H.J. Res. 554. Joint resolution to designate the week of November 11, 1984, through November 17, 1984, as "Women in Agriculture Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.J. Res. 555. Joint resolution to designate July 20, 1984, as "Space Exploration Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMON (for himself and Mr. Gilman):

H.J. Res. 556. Joint resolution to proclaim October 16, 1984, as "World Food Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

372. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relative to H.R. 5185; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

373. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relative to POW-MIA Day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

374. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to Federal health policy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

375. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, relative to foreign steel imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

376. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to programs that would reestablish wolf populations in Idaho; jointly, to the Committees on Inter-

ior and Insular Affairs, Agriculture, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. Brown of California:

H.R. 5520. A bill for the relief of David Labba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Frank:

H.R. 5521. A bill for the relief of Barbara Killion Applegate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Molloy:

H.R. 5522. A bill for the relief of Jody Guthrie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5523. A bill for the relief of Flora C. Ralston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Wolpe:

H.R. 5524. A bill to provide for the free entry of a ring of eight bells for the use of Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, Mich.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 953: Mr. Andrews of North Carolina.

H.R. 1242: Mr. Albosta and Mr. Florio.

H.R. 1315: Mr. Britt, Mr. Gray, Mr. Martin of New York, Mr. Clay, Mr. Roth, and Mr. Rahall.

H.R. 1743: Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Annunzio, Mr. Rinaldo, Mr. Smith of Florida, Mr. Moody, Mr. Richardson, Mr. Price, and Mr. Scheuer.

H.R. 1925: Mr. Courter.

H.R. 1955: Mr. Boucher.

H.R. 1991: Mr. Reid.

H.R. 2474: Mr. Snyder, Mr. Wylie, and Mr. Gejdenson.

H.R. 2837: Mr. McNulty, Mr. Hyde, and Mr. Thomas of Georgia.

H.R. 2944: Mr. Gore.

H.R. 2960: Mr. Panetta and Mr. Studts.

H.R. 3105: Mr. Edgar.

H.R. 3277: Mr. Moody.

H.R. 3282: Mr. Roybal and Mr. Boucher.

H.R. 3811: Mr. Daschle and Mr. Cooper.

H.R. 3832: Mr. Nowak and Mr. Mazzoli.

H.R. 3917: Mr. Lagomarsino.

H.R. 3966: Mr. Paul, Mr. Kindness, Mr. Gramm, Mr. Loeffler, Mr. Bliley, Mr. Young of Missouri, Mr. Corcoran, Mr. Stenholm, Mr. Wolf, Mr. Whitehurst, Mr. Frost, Mr. Tauke, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Vandergriff, Mr. Leath of Texas, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Andrews of Texas, Mr. Dowdy of Mississippi, Mr. Archer, and Mr. Marriott.

H.R. 3987: Mr. Skelton, Mr. Bates, and Mr. Daschle.

H.R. 4080: Mr. Vander Jagt and Mr. Harkin.

H.R. 4098: Mr. Lowery of California and Mr. MacKay.

H.R. 4124: Mr. Dwyer of New Jersey, Mr. Rinaldo, Mr. Shannon, Mr. Walgren, Mr. McCloskey, Mr. Ford of Michigan, Mr. Eckart, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Davis, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Donnelly, Mr. Rose, and Ms. Oakar.

H.R. 4272: Mr. Daniel, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Smith of New Jersey, Mr. Jacobs, and Mr. Ortiz.

H.R. 4273: Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Williams of Montana, Mr. Smith of New Jersey, and Mr. Ortiz.

H.R. 4274: Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Smith of New Jersey, Mr. Dickinson, and Mr. Ortiz.

H.R. 4287: Mr. Tauke.

H.R. 4300: Mr. De Lugo, Mr. Kastenmeier, Mr. Edgar, Mr. Dixon, Mr. McCloskey, Mrs. Kennelly, Mr. Mavroules, Mr. Biaggi, Mr. Wirth, Mr. Bateman, Mrs. Schroeder, Mr. Gejdenson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Daschle, Mr. Gore, Mr. Richardson, and Mr. Torres.

H.R. 4345: Mr. Brown of California.

H.R. 4395: Mr. Shumway, Mr. Minish, Mr. Pursell, and Mr. Edgar.

H.R. 4440: Mr. McKinney and Ms. Oakar.

H.R. 4447: Mr. Wirth, Mr. Gephardt, Mr. Carper, Mr. Hertel of Michigan, Mr. Gray, Mr. Carr, and Mr. Ford of Michigan.

H.R. 4468: Mrs. Burton of California.

H.R. 4571: Mr. Edgar.

H.R. 4642: Mr. Hunter and Mr. McEwen.

H.R. 4685: Mr. Smith of New Jersey.

H.R. 4686: Mr. Smith of New Jersey.

H.R. 4760: Mr. Guarini, Mr. Mrazek, and Mr. Aspin.

H.R. 4772: Mr. Levin of Michigan, Mr. Ackerman, and Mr. Sisisky.

H.R. 4800: Mr. Donnelly and Mr. Frost.

H.R. 4813: Mr. Oberstar.

H.R. 4877: Mr. Huckaby, Mr. Long of Louisiana, and Mr. Williams of Ohio.

H.R. 4966: Mr. Britt, Mr. Edgar, Mr. Feighan, and Mr. Traxler.

H.R. 5011: Mr. Williams of Montana, Mr. DeWine, Mr. Hoyer, Mr. Volkmer, and Mr. Anderson.

H.R. 5015: Mr. Nielson of Utah.

H.R. 5032: Mr. Bates, Mrs. Schneider, Mr. St Germain, Mr. Leland, Mr. Roe, Mr. Mineta, and Mr. Biaggi.

H.R. 5042: Mr. Kildee.

H.R. 5068: Mr. Donnelly.

H.R. 5090: Mr. Bereuter, Mr. Duncan, Mr. Jeffords, Mr. Regula, Mr. Crockett, Mr. Morrison of Connecticut, Mr. Hughes, Mr. McHugh, Mr. Boner of Tennessee, Mr. DeWine, Mr. Daub, Mr. Chappell, Mr. Roe, Mr. Wortley, Mr. Richardson, Mr. MacKay, Mr. McCain, Mr. Sundquist, Mr. Owens, Mr. D'Amours, Mr. De Lugo, Mr. Vento, Mr. Bates, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Gore, Mr. Mrazek, and Mr. Edgar.

H.R. 5108: Mr. Frost, Mr. Corrada, and Mr. Simon.

H.R. 5141: Mr. Boner of Tennessee, Mr. Solarz, Mr. Gray, Mr. Mavroules, Mr. Pepper, Mr. Hance, Mr. Coleman of Texas, Mr. Ralph M. Hall, Mr. Dowdy of Mississippi, Mrs. Collins, Mr. Mitchell, Mrs. Kennelly, Ms. Ferraro, and Mr. Roybal.

H.R. 5173: Mr. Schumer.

H.R. 5195: Mr. Morrison of Connecticut, Mr. Edgar, and Mr. Seiberling.

H.R. 5196: Mr. Britt and Mr. Gore.

H.R. 5238: Mr. Mineta, Mr. Murphy, and Mr. Stokes.

H.R. 5265: Mr. Roybal, Mr. Evans of Iowa, Mr. Hammerschmidt, Mr. McKernan, Mr. Ford of Michigan, Mr. Crockett, Mr. Florio, Mr. Frank, Mrs. Schneider, Mr. Wolpe, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Downey of New York, Mr. Smith of Florida, Ms. Mikulski, and Mr. Albosta.

H.R. 5321: Mr. Clay.

H.R. 5361: Mr. Jacobs.

H.R. 5367: Mr. Smith of New Jersey.

H.R. 5383: Mr. Florio.

H.R. 5389: Mr. Anthony, Mr. Flippo, Mr. Jenkins, and Mr. Russo.

H.R. 5390: Mr. Simon.

H.R. 5391: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HAWKINS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LA FALCE, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. OWENS, Mr. REGULA, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. TORRES, Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio, Mr. WYLIE, and Ms. MIKULSKI.

H.R. 5422: Mr. FANDRY JAGT.

H.R. 5428: Mr. GINGRICH.

H.J. Res. 120: Mr. LUNDINE.

H.J. Res. 254: Mr. COUGHLIN.

H.J. Res. 272: Mrs. BYRON, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. GORE, and Mr. SYNAR.

H.J. Res. 433: Mr. WINN, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. SABO, Mr. EARLY, and Mrs. KENNELLY.

H.J. Res. 446: Mr. LUKE and Mr. RITTER.

H.J. Res. 450: Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. SWIFT, and Mr. ERDREICH.

H.J. Res. 451: Mr. MAC KAY, Mr. RUDD, and Mr. ROEMER.

H.J. Res. 457: Mr. WIRTH, Mr. ROE, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. WALGREN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. FRANK, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. OWENS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MINETA, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DAUB, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. OLIN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LELAND, Mr. FUQUA, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. LA FALCE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. WINN, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BREAU, Mr. BRITT, Mr. CARPER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. REGULA, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Ms. FERRARO, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. REID, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BATEMAN, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. FISH, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MINISH, Mr. GREEN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SABO, Mr. HORTON, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. WEISS, Mr. KASICH, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. COELHO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. BORSKI, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HARRISON, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. SHAW, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. LATA, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. RITTER, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. LENT, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. SIMON, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. PRICE, Mr. RODINO, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. NEAL, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. WEBER, Mr. WOLFE, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. HAYES, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. ALBOSTA, Mr. DYSON, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. MAZZOLI,

Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. YATRON, Mr. BETHUNE, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. VANDERGRIFT, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. DIXON, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. FLORIO, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. BARNES, Mr. ROSE, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. WILSON, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. CARR, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. TORRES, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. SHANNON, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. MICA, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, and Mr. MONTGOMERY.

H.J. Res. 463: Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. LUKE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. SIMON, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. RITTER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. DAUB, Mr. FRANK, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. YATRON, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. CARR, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. RUDD, and Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.J. Res. 472: Mr. SKELTON and Mr. EMERSON.

H.J. Res. 482: Mr. SKELTON, Mr. DAUB, Mr. HYDE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. TRAXLER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. ANTHONY, Ms. FERRARO, and Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.J. Res. 488: Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. FROST, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. RITTER, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. WINN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. CARPER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HUTTO, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. MARRIOTT, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. NEAL, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MINETA, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. BRITT, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. PRICE, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. YATRON, Mr. NICHOLS, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. GREGG, Mr. REID, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. WILSON, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. PEPPER, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. RODINO, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. QUILLIN, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mr. DE LA GARZA.

H.J. Res. 509: Mr. BARNES, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HANCE, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LENT, Mr. DYMAIY, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. MCCURDY.

H.J. Res. 512: Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. FROST, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GUARINI, Ms. FERRARO, Mr. MINISH, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. GREGG, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. EARLY, and Mr. YOUNG of Missouri.

H.J. Res. 528: Mr. KASICH, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BRITT, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MOORE, Mrs. BOGGS, and Mr. BREAU.

H.J. Res. 532: Mr. DEWINE, Mr. FRANK, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WINN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. VENTO, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. CROCKETT, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. BRITT, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. COATS, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. GORE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. HORTON, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. FISH, Mr. SISISKI, Mr. PETRI, Mr. WOLFE, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. TORRES, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. LA FALCE, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. COYNE, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. COELHO, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ROE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. JACOBS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. FROST, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DAUB, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. BARNES, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. OWENS, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. LELAND, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. FLORIO, and Mr. CARNEY.

H.J. Res. 535: Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BRITT, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. SIMON, Mrs. KENNELLY, and Mr. BONIOR of Michigan.

H.J. Res. 537: Mr. SHAW.

H.J. Res. 543: Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. DASCHLE.

H.J. Res. 553: Mr. SHAW.

H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. DYSON.

H. Con. Res. 260: Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. LOWRY of Washington.

H. Con. Res. 265: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. WOLFE.

H. Res. 337: Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. LENT, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. CONTE, Mr. ROE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SIMON, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. FROST, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. UDALL.

H. Res. 468: Mr. TAUKE.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1029: Mr. GLICKMAN.

H.R. 5345: Mr. DORGAN.

H.J. Res. 509: Mr. GLICKMAN.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

346. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the

City Council of Melbourne, Fla., relative to the Comprehensive Crime Control Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

347. Also, petition of the American Public Works Association, Chicago, Ill., relative to the interstate cost estimates; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

348. Also, petition of the Suffolk County Legislature, Riverhead, N.Y., relative to Brookhaven National Laboratory Research Hospital; to the Committee on Science and Technology.